

The  
American Historical Review

A LAYMAN'S VIEW OF HISTORY<sup>1</sup>

SOME time ago I received a pleasant letter from an honored officer of our Association. Among other things he said that his friends and colleagues would be glad to have one more book from me telling how it was that I came to write history. He added friendly words as to the interest of professional teachers of history in the thoughts of laymen like myself. So I am moved to give you a layman's view of history.

The muster-roll of laymen who have written histories is not a mean one. The old world offers us Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Tacitus, no one of whom held a chair at any university. In modern times, in England, we pass from Gibbon down to Grote, and, in our own country, from Parkman to Rhodes. For myself, hovering, as I faintly hope, somewhere on the fringe of this rather Olympian company, I will endeavor to answer in a few words the query in the very friendly letter.

When I was a young man I became bent on devoting my mind and energies to the best things I could find. Not having original and creative gifts, I set myself to the study of what other men had deemed best, and had striven to attain in thought and work and conduct. I had ardently studied law, had practised a very little, and had written a book on *Private Corporations*. But the law seemed too narrow—very far from covering the whole human field; and I turned to look beyond it. Being inclined toward the humanities rather than the sciences, I soon saw that I at least should find the most humanly interesting elements in the aim and the endeavor—the forming an ideal, and the struggle through the man's years, or perhaps through the longer life of a people, to accomplish it. The accomplishment itself, if indeed it is severable from the endeavor, might be beyond the strength either of individual or of race. Achievement lies on the knees of the gods. The true human story is a story of endeavor—the endeavor for the end conceived.

<sup>1</sup> Presidential address delivered before the American Historical Association at Washington, December 28, 1927.

So I began with the ancient world, which is the pit whence we have been digged. And I devoted the ten years that were my supreme education to writing *Ancient Ideals*. That brought my notion of the story down to the time of Christianity. I gave all my time to the book, working eight hours a day, and travelling to see some of the things and countries I was studying. I had very little money, but I used it, and at last sweated blood to pay for the publication of my work.

Then, with the advantage of this discipline of knowledge, I devoted four years to *The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages*. During two of them, I held a lectureship at Columbia, but gave it up as interfering with my real work. Profiting by this further time of study and training, I next put ten enthusiastic years on *The Mediaeval Mind*, and, after that, six or seven years on *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century*. There have been two or three smaller books, *Freedom of the Mind in History*, taking three years; and one that is now in the press bringing me to the present time.

Curiously enough I find that through all these books, if I have not been implicitly saying the same thing, I have, without intending it, been speaking with the voice of my first conviction as to the central human interest of the endeavor and the aim. Forty years, and all my mind and energy, have been put upon these books, which I mention to show the time they have taken. Such as they are, I could not have written them had my time been taken by teaching or academic administration. So much for this layman, now for his view of history.

Our ideas to-day of things about us are neither particular nor static. Rather we conceive a ceaseless movement to pervade the world; and we imagine that a like unbroken movement has brought all things to the present state of heterogeneous correlation as parts of a prodigiously variegated whole. Apparently it is one and the same universal movement that extends throughout our present world and reaches back through time. Within its sweep, past and present become a continuum, and our contemporary happenings are drawn into some real or conceptual unity. We recognize one vibrant current constituting an energizing and effective process. Each event is harnessed to the other, and the present emerges from the past. All seems an organic and possibly intelligent becoming. Perhaps this becoming is manifested most concretely in plants and animals. They *are* their past: phylogenetically as the present form of a somehow evolving species, and ontogenetically, since each living individual

carries its line of ancestry to be handed on. These notions are not wholly new, yet they work in us to-day with new meaning.

If we turn from this universal process to our experience or knowledge of its phenomena, we find a like absence of barriers and separation. Fences are down between the fields of knowledge, which have become one vast *unenclosure*. Save for convenience of designation and prosecution, the sciences are no longer distinct and separate, but phases of each other, while philosophy would enfold them all in its consideration. Not unallied with them are philology, archaeology, all scholarship if you will. Indeed knowledge would conceivably become one, were there a mind genial enough to grasp it in its entirety.

Every element of our knowledge of the present world of man and nature is necessarily connected with our knowledge of that past through which man and the world he lives in have come to be what they are. We need make no distinction between our knowledge of living animals and contemporary human institutions, and our knowledge of their antecedent stages. Every political or legal institution has come into existence gradually, or has arisen by notable mutation. The laws regulating corporations are of divers origin, yet there is continuity between the present body of corporation law and its multifarious past; and there need be no division in our knowledge of the past and present of this legal Briareus.

The continuity, or even oneness, between past and present is evident in the forms or provinces of knowledge. The science of physiology, for example, is a gradual and beautiful growth; its present state implies and includes its past, just as the animal organs, whose functions it treats of, contain their past genetically. Physics, so called, is also an emergence from its past, but more apparently by the way of mutation. Its fundamental conceptions appear to have suffered reversal. Yet if the old solidities of matter have been replaced by nimble units of electric energy, still the group of principles applying to the action of tangible bodies are as valid as they have ever been, and carry over the bulk of the science in its continuity. A more concrete illustration of mutation accompanying continuity is the manner in which relativity has, for a time at least, been grafted upon Newtonian gravitation.

And philosophy, that elastic method of ultimate consideration, of thinking any and all problems of the mind out to their final conclusions or despairs—this method or tissue of ultimate thinking assuredly becomes its whole self only in the oneness of its present with its past.

Yet changes come, and each age has its intellectual tendencies. Scientific or philosophic conceptions of the world are, of course, part

of the thinking, even the temper, of a period. In modern physics the concepts of relativity and the substitution of electricity and motion for stolid matter are expressions of the spirit, the dynamic restlessness, of our times. So is our science of psychology, not to mention psychoanalysis specifically. A future age, with another temperament and mentality, may not be satisfied with them.

Knowledge is experience. But not all experience is knowledge, since experience may come in the guise of feeling or intuition. Such experience is direct, and is not apprehended through cognition and statement. Indeed much of our experience is rather untranslatable into knowledge or rational statement. Experience of the past, however, commonly takes the form of knowledge, or of doubt or conscious ignorance—the two latter being a mode of cognition or failure to know. Yet contemplation of a past event may stir our feeling and, as it were, arouse an intuitive sense of its import. To that extent our experience of the past might not take the form of knowledge.

In philosophy, realists and idealists still dispute as to the relation of all forms of experience to the assumed external world—the world past and present, I would add. Whatever be this relation, the point I wish to make is that our knowledge of the past and our knowledge of the present bear a like relation to the data or objects of their respective worlds. Knowledge of the past is the same sort of absorption or mirror of events as knowledge of the present. And if in any way knowledge of the present world should be held to reach practical identity with the assumed objective data, so one might hold as to knowledge of the past.

Again, as each man's knowledge, or other experience, of the present differs from that of his fellows, so will his knowledge of the past. This is strikingly true of historians living in different ages. Each age, with its own interests and view of life, will find in the past a different range of facts and interests. To different succeeding ages the past will appear, and even *be*, different.

As touching the intellectual identity in us of past and present, we should distinguish between evident forms of knowledge, like the sciences, and the material, for example, of past politics and war. The scholar may identify his knowledge of philosophy with philosophy's past as well as present, but will pause before identifying the Battle of Waterloo with his knowledge of it. In this respect, I should group religion and the fine arts of expression with philosophy and the sciences. For they also are an intrinsic part of the growth of the human spirit, of its feeling, its intuition; part, indeed, of the whole nature of man. To be sure, the whole nature of man, including reason, may exercise itself in battles. But in them there is more



physical fact and violence than in the growth of poetry and painting, or the sweeter modes of religion.

With such rather crude distinctions in mind, I introduce the word "history". As applied to modes of human growth—science, philosophy, religion, and art—I regard their history as identical with the stages of their past, which is projecting itself into the present. This is one of the two current meanings of the term. For "history" is taken sometimes as descriptive narrative and sometimes as the subject-matter itself in its evolving course and processes. Both senses of the word exist, whatever be the topic. Thus the "history" of the earth may be either the narrative called geology, or may be the very changes which geology is attempting to describe. And a "history" of mankind may be the narrative or, on the other hand, the very actual series of poignant human facts which follow on throughout the ages. In this sense the history of mankind would be mankind itself coming gradually to its present state; or the history of institutions would be the institutions themselves in the course of their growth; and, of course, the history of art or science would be art or science in its checkered course.

Clearly enough, if history, taken as narrative, is to be a thing of life and truth it must embody the verity, or veritable history, of the past; that is, must keep itself vitally one with the unfolding subject-matter which it is presenting. And it should absorb and re-express the elements of power moving the drama of mankind.

But a narrative composition is itself an event. It is part of the substance of its age, part of the intellectual conditions (which are actualities) of the time of its composition. The mind of Thucydides and the history which he wrote were elements of the period of the Peloponnesian War. So the sardonic Roman temper of Tacitus and the histories he composed were part of his epoch. Obviously contemporary documents and state papers are part of the event which they record. But Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* was one of the events of the eighteenth century, and part of the linkage between that century's consciousness of itself and understanding of the past. We may speak in the same way of Mommsen's very Prussian *History of Rome*.

More brilliant examples of things which are events and also narratives are the works of imaginative literature and the figurative arts. They too are records and also profoundly part of the substance of events. The *Iliad* or the *Divina Commedia* is a concrete manifestation, a supreme expression, of the qualities of an epoch. On the other hand, if these poems are not what are called historical narratives, they are records and masses of evidence. So the Parthenon, or Chartres Cathedral, is a document, a piece of evidence, even a vehicle of nar-

rative. But each of these temples is also a concrete and monumental embodiment of the skill, the resources and capacities, and the intellectual and spiritual qualities of an epoch.

So the works of Plato and Aquinas are demonstrative evidence of the Greek and medieval minds. They are also part of the substance of their respective epochs just as truly as the Battle of Plataea or the Babylonian captivity of the Holy See.

For the purpose of this address, I am taking "history" in the more vital sense of the very life and actuality of the past, out of which the present has arisen. And the two points which I have endeavored to bring out are, first, the oneness between the present and the past, and, secondly, the view of "history" as this very living past and present which, as narrative, it seeks to bring to a descriptive statement.

There is a further point of view which seems proper for us. We are historians and scholars, and I would say humanists, rather than physicists, mathematicians, or biologists. Whatever may be the view of our brethren the scientists, man is for us historians the centre of the world. We regard the sciences humanistically, as manifestations of the human mind and a phase of its growth. We are not investigators of the substantial data of the sciences, nor judges of their hypothetical accuracy or possible falsity as descriptions of the world. We are concerned with science as one of the modes of advance of human thought. And we bear in mind that physical science, and each branch of it, is a unity and a whole, made of its present and its past; so that the history of any science is verily that science itself in its entirety and continuous course from its beginning to what it is now and hereafter shall come to be.

We take similar interest in philosophy, that method and mass of ultimate consideration of fact or verity. We would regard it in its totality, which is its unity, and consists in an age-long and necessary mode of thought.

Many of us believe that religion is from God; but for us as historians it is another mode of the flowering of the human spirit, yet rather in the way of intuition and immediate conviction than by the gray path of reason. For us the past and present of religion, in all its manifestations, is one, even as philosophy is one. And we would make and keep our history of religion a true expression of its manifold growth and being.

In the same way we would work as historians of those glories of the mind which come to us in the forms of poetry and imaginative prose, and in the forms of the visual arts. And similarly would we view all human institutions, social, political, and belligerent—for man

is a warring animal. We consider them in their time-unity, and, in studying them, should hold their past as one with their latest manifestations. So we weave into their growing web the salient events—battles, dynastic changes, executions, famines, and noisy revolutions, through which they have wound their course.

If we seek a further and universal unification of our conceptions of these manifold courses of human growth, perhaps we shall find it in a conception of humanity, of human life, one in its fruitful past and pregnant present. Human life may well be held a universal and dynamic unity in its manifestations, past, present, and to come; though for our intellectual and classificatory convenience we divide it into branches.

And now, if our considerations are valid, it becomes clear in what spirit and with what thoughts in mind we should write and teach history. We should strive to maintain this twofold unity, that of the time-dimension of past and present, and the pervasive unity of human life through its divers manifestations in religion, philosophy, science, institutions, and conduct. We should teach and write history as the veritable mirror, the *alter ego*, of this vibrant whole and unity of human growth. No one can compass this universal story. But each of us may set forth what he has to teach so that all the facts shall be constituent, and each fact shall appear in its topical relationship and exhibit its causal bearing. The story, and every part of it, is a linked emergent growth; and the facts which possess the broadest rational and connective value will best show its succeeding stages. Through the choice of such cardinal and potent facts, perhaps we may be able to present our topic in its furthest truth—as a chord in the symphony of man.

An awful time-honored figure looms before us, demanding to be dealt with. Its name is "historical fact". Since our history, taught or written, is to be truthful, the very *alter ego* of the course of events, one must take pains to be accurate. There is no telling when some small accuracy may prove a luminous link in the causal sequence. But usually accuracy relates to details and circumstances rather than to the larger features of the story. How can one be accurate about the Battle of Salamis or the assassination of Julius Caesar?—even though one were a contemporary with access to the newspapers of the following day. One will look to them for obvious details, which buzz about the fact. As for the event in its more essential nature, the historian will have to construct it out of his best knowledge and intelligence. Using our points of data, we form a conclusion as to how the event must have taken place, or probably took place. This is what every historian does of necessity. When he has determined the de-

tails, he has the more arduous task of their joinder and interpretation. Insight and judgment apply to this process, rather than accuracy. The result must be largely a matter of wise inference.

There are still two further considerations touching the conception of "historical fact". One is the human equation, and the other the multiple significance of every so-called fact.

Mark well the disturbing function of the human equation. Not merely is the fact's interpretation affected, in ways dependent on the interpreter's intelligence and bent of interest. But, beyond this, a molding and creative manifold of understanding enters and makes part of the fact itself. Caesar's death had different significance for each one of those Roman notables whose swords met in his body. It was differently intended, and also bore different results, according to the temperament, motives, and situation of each. Indeed it was for each a different fact. No fact can be in and of itself alone. Every fact comes to pass in its relationships and bearings, as well as in itself—if indeed there be any clearly marked and delimited *itself*. The causes of Caesar's death had worked up to it through the whole antecedent history of Rome—of mankind, if you will. More immediately it was brought about by the tempers and motives of the conspirators. Neither its causes, its manifold significance, nor its effects could be the same for an ethical intellectual like Brutus and for the sweaty mob about to take the air in Caesar's gardens beyond the Tiber.

Not only a striking event like Caesar's death, but every incident in life is exhaustless in its bearings; and since its substance extends to its relationships and effects, a multiplicity of actuality as well as meaning is very part of it.

But, furthermore, the understanding of a fact by contemporaries is part of its bearing and effect, and so part of the fact itself. This would, of course, apply to divergent understandings of it. Accounts that differ may be equally justifiable and equally true. Each one may set forth a different phase. Divergent histories, contemporary or future, may be each a receptacle and true expression of some actuality. But such histories are also part of the bearing and result of the fact, and so a part of it. And this is the ground of the justifiability, and indeed of the transcendent unity, of history as narrative and as one and the same with the course of the events described. As the events form an organic continuum, so should the expression be.

There is still a last complexity—perplexity it may seem. The very notion of fact, and what the real fact is, has varied marvellously among men; and this too, with no conscious weighing of the metaphysics of the matter. The phenomena, for example, of what we

call the physical or natural world have been very differently viewed. Ordinary people accept them for what they appear. But the old Greek philosophers sought to find beneath them a profounder and causally explanatory fact. Such was the water of Thales, the atoms of Democritus, or the substance of Aristotle, or, if you will, the Ideas of Plato. None of these was either visible or tangible. Each was rather an explanation, an hypothesis, an assumed fact thrust forward, or thrust under, to explain things as they appeared. The nuclei and electrons of our modernized atoms may be a fact of this character. The ether at all events is such an explanatory fact, or hypothesis; and comes and goes at the call of physical theory.

Again, physical facts may be accepted symbolically; regarded as symbols of the verity which they carry, or which indeed they *are*, to the rightly instructed mind. The Church Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries were prone to regard the facts of nature as symbols of the spiritual verity which it was their function to shadow forth. And, for some philosophers of the Middle Ages, the natural world, both in its creation and as presented before their eyes, was a divinely ordered allegory. Its actual reality, which appearances merely shadowed forth, lay in its spiritual and saving import.

As for so-called historical events, the Church Fathers, and after them the medieval theologians, admitted rather grudgingly the literal truth of the Old Testament narratives. That was but "the letter that killeth". The profounder verity, the deeper fact, was the salvation prefigured in them. It was their saving prefigurative meaning, which held "the spirit that maketh to live".

Some of us moderns, our Wordsworth for example, would still tend to find the deeper reality in the lesson, the teaching, the spiritual import of Nature. And in philosophy our extreme idealists, from Bishop Berkeley on, can find no reality beyond our thought.

Many of us to-day who are neither given over to allegory nor idealists of Berkeley's type still hesitate before our choice of fact or truth. We are haunted by the faith that the surest and most veritable fact is that which our whole human nature, passionate, spiritual, and intellectual, might somehow conspire to substantiate. Fact may not be just as we see it, or scientifically observe it. And perhaps fact is not just as reason argues it. Assuredly it is not what impulse and emotional conviction would declare; our intuitions will not suffice. We crave the concurrent verdict—if we could only get it—of all the faculties of our cognitive and assertive selves.

Thus I have tried to set before you a layman's view, in which history shall not be mere narrative, nor merely the series of events forming the past; but shall incorporate and be the onward-striding

thought, the interwoven tissue of event itself, the element of continuity without which nothing is or can ever have been. Every object in nature, every bit of science, every philosophic theory, every phase and kind of religion, and every constructive or destructive act of life, possesses the constituent of being and becoming which is time. And the history of politics, of science, of philosophy, of art, or of religion, is politics, science, philosophy, art, or religion in its genesis, its emergent growth, its present, or even future, culmination and decay, through which its elements pass into other phases of the cosmic process.

HENRY OSBORN TAYLOR.

## SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY AS LIAISON BETWEEN HISTORY AND SOCIOLOGY

THE use of historical data for the purpose of reaching social psychological generalizations concerning social institutions and collective behavior has been subject to attack from both historians and sociologists. Such a combination, it is declared, is neither good history nor sound sociology; it is only a muddling confusion of two methods, each of which has its valuable function to perform if only it be left free from entangling alliances. The misunderstanding arises largely from the need of defining the terms history and sociology, and at the same time maintaining the connection between the two studies as thus differentiated.

It is the purpose of this essay to try to resolve these difficulties and thus to answer methodological criticisms of the approach indicated above. This will be attempted by discussing (1) the relation of this method to history as critically defined, (2) its relation to sociology, and (3) its use of social psychology as liaison between the two. The question, though apparently an abstract and futile query, is fundamental. The controversy has been, and continues to be, a keen one, the roots of which lead into profound considerations of underlying logical principles of science. The nature of these problems will, it is hoped, become clearer as the discussion proceeds.

### I. *Is the method sound history?*

The answer to this question can not be given until we have a definition of what constitutes history. The history of historiography<sup>1</sup> lies beyond our present scope. The word itself reflects its earlier meaning. *La storia, l'histoire, die Geschichte*, all mean the narrative of what happened. History was a narrative art, more closely allied with literature than with philosophy or science. It is so considered by many to-day.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, with the insistence on closer relations of knowledge to life, dissatisfaction arose with the mere cataloguing of facts, because it led to no explanatory conclusion.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, there followed emphasis on a *connected* account

<sup>1</sup> J. T. Shotwell, *The History of History*; V. Letelier, *La Evolución de la Historia*.

<sup>2</sup> The Italian school of Croce, Villari, *et al.* Cf. G. Papini, *Life of Christ*, p. 11. E. C. Lindeman seems to subscribe to this same view, though as member of the opposite camp. *Social Discovery*, pp. 40 f.

<sup>3</sup> See F. J. Teggart, *Processes of History*, pp. 35 ff.



of events; which in turn involved some conception of the meaning of the events for each other.<sup>4</sup> This shift of emphasis from facts to meanings marks the beginning at once of modern history and of the controversy which has been waged about the method of interpretation of history. Though interpretations of history date back to Aristotle and Plato, and to the early Hebrew historians, the systematic attempts to find a "thread of historical development" are comparatively modern. At any rate the current war against the philosophy of history finds its targets principally in the last century. Prevailing types of historical interpretation through the ages reflect faithfully the dominant intellectual interest of the successive periods.<sup>5</sup>

It has now become respectable to define history as "the record of the transitions and transformations of human activity";<sup>6</sup> as "a study of how man has come to be as he is and to believe as he does".<sup>7</sup> This is not to be confused with philosophy, which seeks "a system of ideas or judgments, as abstract as possible, utterly denuded of all the accidents of time and space", and explains facts in defining them.<sup>8</sup>

What, then, is this technic of modern historians? S. J. Case presents the following characteristics: (1) it must deal with concrete data (the "documentary statistics" so often discussed); (2) society must be the point of departure in historical reconstruction, for documents are after all a product of the social order; (3) history must be treated as an on-going process, a development; (4) hence it is concerned with genetic relationships—the causal nexus underlying the phenomena; (5) these demand a recognition of various types of contacts with the environment, physical, social, and psychological; (6) it will be interested in institutions as revealing the common habits and beliefs of a particular age.<sup>9</sup> To these may be added a seventh, which may be assumed to be characteristic of all scientific, scholarly study: it will be disinterested as a prime condition of its giving a reliable statement of historical facts and sequences.<sup>10</sup> "The historical character is not in the facts, but in the manner of knowing them."<sup>11</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. F. Pollard, *Factors in Modern History*, pp. 2 f.

<sup>5</sup> J. T. Shotwell, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XVIII. 692 ff. See the suggestive sketch read by Professor Carl Becker before the American Sociological Society, *Proceedings of the Am. Sociol. Soc.*, VII. (1912) 73-107.

<sup>6</sup> J. Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct*, p. 110.

<sup>7</sup> J. H. Robinson, *Mind in the Making*, p. 6.

<sup>8</sup> W. Roscher, *Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die Staatswirtschaft*, etc., quoted by A. W. Small, *Origins of Sociology*, p. 156.

<sup>9</sup> "The Historical Study of Religion", in *Journal of Religion*, I. (1921) 2-8.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. C. Seignobos, *Revue Philosophique*, XXIV. 29.

<sup>11</sup> Langlois and Seignobos, *Introd. to the Study of History*, p. 63 n.

In detail this method proceeds as follows:<sup>12</sup> (1) The student seeks his facts. These are revealed only indirectly through the medium of traces and effects, rather than by direct observation. These traces, however, are of two kinds: traces on physical objects which are directly observed; and traces on the human mind, which are transmitted orally or in writing. The details of the process of ascertaining the facts are set down at some length by Professor Seignobos in an article on "Les Conditions Psychologiques de la Connaissance en Histoire".<sup>13</sup> The methodological problems at this stage are principally those of documentary criticism; though the same writer elsewhere<sup>14</sup> points out that there are three kinds of facts: the conceptions and motives clearly avowed by authors, the motives and ideas attributed by authors to their contemporaries, and the motives which we may attribute to them on the basis of our own motives. (This last reveals the limits of the introspective psychology which Seignobos is applying; but to this we shall return later.)

(2) Having accumulated documentary statistics, the student next groups his facts.<sup>15</sup> These classifications may follow lines of chronological, geographical, or logical (psychological?) order. Continually repeated facts (*sic*) must be balanced by particular facts which give them historical context and meaning; and due place must be given to accidental events which may modify historical trends.

(3) Then follows the attempt to connect facts where documentary data are lacking; which must be done, in history, by constructive reasoning. Here the following precautions must be observed: (a) reasoning should never be combined with the analysis of a document to fill lacunae or to organize materials; (b) facts derived from direct examination should never be confused with inferred data; (c) unconscious reasoning (*i.e.*, reasoning not conforming to logic) is never permissible; (d) if reasoning leaves the least doubt, no attempt should be made to state a conclusion, but the findings should be left in the conjectural stage; (e) it is not permissible to return to a conjecture and endeavor to transform it into a certainty, for this opens the way for prejudiced judgment.<sup>16</sup>

(4) Now comes the most precarious step in a scientific history: the development of inferences from established facts, or the induction from specific data to general laws. This type of reasoning must be

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, *passim*.

<sup>13</sup> *Revue Philosophique*, XXIV. 1-32, 168-190. See also F. H. Giddings, *Scientific Study of Human Society*, pp. 100-102.

<sup>14</sup> Langlois and Seignobos, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 232-251.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 252-254. See J. M. Vincent, *Historical Research*, p. 278.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXIII.—18.

governed by the following rules:<sup>17</sup> The procedure will begin with the particular historical fact, seek a general proposition or law based on experience of human affairs, and conclude with an inference from the fact. To draw a safe conclusion two conditions must be met: the general proposition must be accurate, being inseparably a connection between the two facts; and only such propositions may be used as go into detail, hence demanding detailed knowledge of the particular fact which must first be established beyond doubt. The general law used as the basis of such inference must be formulated so as to guarantee that in every case where  $x$  occurs  $y$  occurs. Isolated details or abstract facts should be avoided lest there be over-generalizing from inadequate data. All conditions operating in the milieu in which the fact is found must be taken into account.

But we have now reached very controversial ground, as between the "older" historians and the "new" history. The controversy hinges upon the question whether a science of history is either desirable or possible. The position of the "new" history is really a concession to current educational demands for social values in the curriculum, which insist that history must make some contribution to contemporary life. This contribution is either that of providing a genetic account of current social phenomena,<sup>18</sup> or else the provision of parallel situations for purposes of comparison.<sup>19</sup> The former point of view would seem to limit effective history to the last century or so, except in the cases of deep-rooted features of contemporary life such as ancient creeds still uttered, Greek patterns in art, or Roman precedents in law. The latter position, stressing the essential similarity of human reactions throughout history,<sup>20</sup> believes in the possibility of tracing definite relations which may be called "typical" or "inevitable" in given situations. It is with this latter interpretation of the function of history that we are here concerned.<sup>21</sup>

We are accordingly involved in a problem of crucial importance for our discussion. If we are to secure light upon current social institutions and movements by comparing the social processes with presumably analogous processes in the past, our major premise must be that it is possible to formulate general laws which, like scientific

<sup>17</sup> Langlois and Seignobos, *op. cit.*, pp. 257-261.

<sup>18</sup> J. H. Robinson, *The New History*, pp. 17-25.

<sup>19</sup> *Am. Jour. Sociology*, XXXI. 186 (but contrast with this the protest of the *New Statesman*, X., 1917, 300-301, against such a tendency toward philistinism); Auguste Comte, *Positive Philosophy* (ed. Martineau), II. 162; F. Harrison, *Meaning of History*, ch. I.; S. J. Case, *Journal of Religion*, I. (1921) 5, 15 f.

<sup>20</sup> Even Vincent acknowledges this (*Hist. Research*, p. 177).

<sup>21</sup> See H. E. Barnes, *The New History and the Social Studies*, p. 341; H. Berr, *La Synthèse en Histoire*, pp. 228 f.

laws, may be used for limited prediction. This method is best summarized by one of its most severe critics, Eduard C. Lindeman:<sup>22</sup>

In simplified form the historical method proceeds by:

- a. Selection of significant events.
- b. Accurate description of those events.
- c. Discovery of the causes and effects involved in the events.
- d. Prediction of future events in terms of the cause-and-effect relationships discovered in past events.

Not all historians, to say nothing of the critics of the historical method, are agreed that the last two steps belong intrinsically to history.

Let us first survey the arguments against the validity of this historical method, and then see whether they can be answered satisfactorily.

(1) The first group of arguments is directed against the conception of "laws of history". It is said that the "underlying nexus" of which Case speaks is not accessible to observation, and that accordingly the causal factors which play so important a part in the development of scientific laws can not be isolated. The complexity of social phenomena forces a simplification which may too readily become over-simplification and thus scientifically invalid;<sup>23</sup> and the "adjusting process" in the historical situation "must ever escape the historian".<sup>24</sup>

(2) The other problem raised by the conception of "historical laws" is that:

The realities of history are unique realities. . . . For any given reality the facts of importance are, then, not those common to a number of realities, but rather those that give to the one reality its uniqueness. The facts of importance in representing and explaining Luther are not those common to all leaders of religious revolt, but rather those that make Luther unique, that distinguish him from all other leaders.<sup>25</sup>

This idea of the function of history is reinforced even by so prominent a sociologist as E. A. Ross, who distinguishes history from sociology on the basis that history is concerned only with the individual, unique, particular events, while sociology is only interested in repeated events capable of formulation into general laws.<sup>26</sup> The historian, he says, "clings to the particular while the sociologist cancels out the particular".<sup>27</sup> According to this point of view, to fit a particular

<sup>22</sup> *Social Discovery*, pp. 36 f.

<sup>23</sup> M. C. Otto, *Things and Ideals*, pp. 83 f.

<sup>24</sup> E. C. Lindeman, *op. cit.*, pp. 38 f. Also Langlois and Seignobos, *op. cit.*, pp. 284, 288.

<sup>25</sup> H. Johnson, *The Teaching of History*, p. 25.

<sup>26</sup> *Foundations of Sociology*, pp. 81-84.

<sup>27</sup> P. 84.

event into a general law is to rob it of its essential quality as an historical fact.

(3) Another form of the attack upon a science of history is based upon the notion of repetition as the basis of scientific generalization. Science, it is said, is interested only in repeated coincidences. Only recurrent facts are for it significant. But history never repeats itself, never presents recurrent or identical situations. Therefore history is not amenable to laws, like natural science.<sup>28</sup>

(4) Or again, the protest arises from the side of the philosopher, who objects that "laws" of history negate the freedom of the human will. In reaction against the various determinisms of historical theories, and out of a suspicion that rigid mechanisms were being formulated without regard to all the human facts involved there came the emphasis in social philosophy upon human freedom of will.<sup>29</sup> Thus Henry Osborn Taylor in a rather inconsistent book on *The Freedom of the Mind in History* says:

The wilful choices of the mind are the true human factors in human progress or retrogression. And sometimes these decisions of the free intelligence show themselves so apparently adverse to the leading of circumstance and material advantage, so disregarding of it all, as to make a true antinomy, a conflicting principle of will athwart the sequences of natural law.<sup>30</sup>

(5) A fifth line of attack is that which emphasizes the fact that science is based on relations of cause and effect. It is argued that in the field of history the establishing of causal relations is unreliable, because, in the first place, that which precedes is not *de facto* a cause of that which follows. To trace chronological sequences is not to establish a genetic relationship between the events.<sup>31</sup> Or further, the coincidence of two events, A and B, does not establish a causal relation, for four possibilities, not two, exist: that A caused B, that B caused A, or (and here lies the difficulty) that A and B were caused by C, or that A was caused by C and B by D. A methodological danger is pointed out by Langlois and Seignobos: that a predilection as to the causal relation may all too easily operate selectively upon the documents, creating a tacit contest between what *is* in the documents and what *is to be expected* in the light of the preconceived "law" of such events.<sup>32</sup> Lindeman<sup>33</sup> goes so far as to say that

<sup>28</sup> Lindeman, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-48; *New Statesman*, X. 301; Vincent, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>29</sup> See Herbert Croly's introduction to Lindeman, *op. cit.*, pp. x f.

<sup>30</sup> P. 23. Cf. pp. 15-25; also Lindeman, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

<sup>31</sup> See M. M. Davis, *Psychological Interpretations of Society*, p. 221. Cf. Lindeman, *op. cit.*, p. 17 n. 10.

<sup>32</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 144, n.

<sup>33</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

practically all historical cause-and-effect relationships are rationalizations of this sort. He further adds that the complexity of the stimulus-response mechanism in groups makes clear definition of cause and effect impossible.<sup>34</sup> It is in connection with this phase of the problem that the distinction has meaning which precludes from history that which starts with premises from the present to explore the past, insisting that on the contrary history starts with the past to explain the present.<sup>35</sup> It is objected, finally, that the search for relations of cause and effect leads to arbitrary isolation of the special action and reaction studied from the related social process,<sup>36</sup> thus giving no adequate perspective.<sup>37</sup>

(6) Two quite extreme criticisms may be noted in passing, though they will scarcely be taken very seriously by historical methodologists. The first is the sweeping statement of Lindeman to the effect that even the descriptive data of history are uncertain for scientific purposes. In this connection he cites three difficulties in accurate historical description: (a) that no one can accurately report an event he has not observed; (b) that even an historical composite of witnesses is invalidated by partiality; and (c) that any observer's descriptions are colored by presuppositions as to cause and effect.<sup>38</sup> The other criticism comes from a member of the Italian school of intuitionists, represented by Benedetto Croce and Pasquale Villari. Croce believes that history can not become a science, because it is really an art; that is, science is concerned with the general concepts derived by thought, while art is concerned with intuitions arising from the imagination, and it is futile to attempt to translate imaginative intuition into scientific concepts.<sup>39</sup> Villari, who says that the key to history lies not so much in rational analysis as in artistic appreciation,<sup>40</sup> stresses the difficulty of making social sciences exact, like natural and physical sciences, in the following vague words: "I believe that it will always remain an insoluble problem unless the work of science and reason is supported by that of conscience, which is also a revealer of truth."<sup>41</sup>

Briefly summarized, then, the reasons for denying the validity of a science of history are as follows: science is based upon recurrence of events in such inseparable unity as to compel us to formulate a relationship of cause and effect which binds them together so re-

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 43 (an astounding statement for a sociologist!).

<sup>35</sup> G. Mentz, *Deutsche Rundschau*, CCIII. 25.

<sup>36</sup> Lindeman, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. S. Mathews, *Spiritual Interpretation of History*, p. 191.

<sup>38</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 40 f.

<sup>39</sup> Cited by Berr, *La Synthèse en Histoire*, p. 235.

<sup>40</sup> *Studies*, pp. 77 ff.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 88.

peatedly. History never presents us with such recurrence of identical situations as to make such correlations possible. Furthermore, the historical method fails to reveal the underlying processes. The real quality of an event is found in its uniqueness, its individuality, which is lost when it is subjected to that process of abstraction whereby only its duplicated features are preserved as conditions of its membership in a class of similar events. Human action can never be reduced to an exact science since it includes an unpredictable and absolutely chance factor of free will, which frequently upsets all "laws". Finally, historical records can not furnish us with the necessary details to establish and verify relationships of cause and effect; and any attempt to find such relationships produces light not upon the historical events, but rather upon the rationalizations of the researcher.<sup>42</sup>

If these objections were all sustained, then the historico-sociological method would stand condemned. Let us therefore examine the arguments and see if they are as incontrovertible as they appear.

The basic assumption of the nature of science is that it is not concerned with unique phenomena, but only with recurrent facts. It should be noted in passing that there are sciences which concern themselves with unique phenomena in an endeavor to describe them accurately.<sup>43</sup> Such are descriptive astronomy, geology, geography, palaeontology, the classification of species. Yet even these are concerned with general characteristics of the individual as lasting phenomena. But this fact does not destroy the general contention that the type of science of history with which we are here concerned, "the science of men in their activities as social beings",<sup>44</sup> involves the conception of repetition. Quite obviously, it was with historical repetitions that Tarde was concerned:<sup>45</sup>

Science is the coordination of phenomena regarded from the side of their *repetitions*. . . . Repetition means the production of something that at the same time preserves the original; . . . History, as we know, becomes a science only when the relations of causality which it reveals are shown to exist between a general cause, capable of repetition or actually repeating itself, and a general effect, also repeated or capable of repetition.

<sup>42</sup> The last group of criticisms is not here included because that of Lindeman, if taken seriously, would invalidate not only the entire volume in which it is included, but also negative all the significance of social research, which is bound by the same tests of evidence. Those of Croce and Villari are obscurantist; and, in so far as apprehensible, are to be considered as a problem in esthetics. The lack of grasp of the idea of a science of history is betrayed in a phrase where Villari speaks of "the science or philosophy of history". *Studies*, p. 108.

<sup>43</sup> See Berr, *op. cit.*, pp. 111 f.

<sup>44</sup> E. Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der Historischen Methode*, p. 6.

<sup>45</sup> G. Tarde, *Social Laws*, pp. 3 f., 6.



Against such correlations Lindeman protests on the ground that to concentrate on correlations (especially with the present) may blind the student to new factors in the present situation<sup>46</sup> (and, he might have added, to unique factors in the past incident). But to urge this complaint is to condemn a science of history for perils which inhere in all scientific correlations. Even a casual study of scientific controversies reveals how various theories have been, and are still being, refuted on grounds of excluding certain important data. Furthermore, it is unfair to condemn historical science for lack of identity in recurrence, for in no science is absolute identity of recurrent situations guaranteed. This is why even physical sciences present laws which are designed to cover only specific phases of the parallel situations, or to cover the probability of recurrence only within specific limits. It is here that we encounter the problem of constants and variables. In physical science the "success" (*i.e.*, the identical recurrence of coincident phenomena) of a given experiment is guaranteed only if the "conditions are right" (*i.e.*, if the maximum of factors are kept constant, or identical with those of the initial experiment). If history is to be brought under any such laws,<sup>47</sup> then the constant factor and the variables must be clearly understood at the outset. There is real danger of confusing similar situations with identical situations, because of certain of the variable factors happening to resemble each other in correlated incidents. Not all things that look alike have the same significance: two revolutions may be alike characterized by the execution of the monarch, by the ferocity of certain revolutionary judges, or by the release of criminals from prisons, but these do not thereby furnish us with a "law" of revolutions. Seignobos has offered a method of study of documents which would serve to correct careless analogical reasoning, emphasizing the need of care in proceeding from signs to their symbolic significance, to the ideas they attempt to express, to the possible figurative use of the ideas, etc.<sup>48</sup> "We must not compare together isolated details or secondary characteristics, but groups of facts which resemble each other in a whole set of characteristics."<sup>49</sup> Professor Lindeman, despite his opposition, admits that: "if history repeating itself merely means that because of the habit-nature of man it is possible to discover similarities of response and adjustment in varying situations in time, no objections can be made."<sup>50</sup> Here we have the crux of the

<sup>46</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 46-48.

<sup>47</sup> That Comte believed it could is revealed in his phrase "Social Physics".

<sup>48</sup> *Revue Philosophique*, XXIV. 172 f.

<sup>49</sup> Langlois and Seignobos, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

<sup>50</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 47 f.

whole matter: the concession that there are certain constants in history which may be subsumed under "the habit-nature of man". Thus one of the leading historical sociologists of America writes:<sup>51</sup> "The sociologist confines his studies to those universal or constant portions of ever repeated history that admit of examination by scientific methods." What these are we shall see later in detail. The assumption is that they are human factors.

But this only raises another objection, stated earlier in this essay: that human factors are never constant and that, because of the freedom of the human will, the element of chance always dominates. This objection rests, naturally, upon historical study; but historiography has always emphasized the interesting, the startling, and therefore the unusual. Consequently it has been preoccupied with the variables rather than with the constants. Now variables decrease in startling quality in proportion as the knowledge of laws increases, revealing the features which they hold in common with certain familiar (*i.e.*, constant) phenomena. Hence the progress of scientific understanding must inevitably impinge upon the remarkable in history. This may serve to explain the protests of the artist who stresses the impressive and individual, and of the theologian whose emphasis is upon the mystery of the Divine Will.<sup>52</sup>

The mental processes of the historian as he differentiates laws of history from chance happenings are illuminated by Poincaré when he shows how the historian, compelled to select facts from a vast array, chooses what seem to him most important (say) in two succeeding centuries. If the "important" facts in the sixteenth century are clearly related to "important" facts of the seventeenth century, we speak of laws of history. If, on the other hand, the facts of the latter century have no "important" antecedents in the former, then we speak of chance happening.<sup>53</sup> Something of this selective method is reflected in the advice of Langlois and Seignobos to the historiographer to avoid superficial and *conventional* facts.<sup>54</sup> One can not help suspecting that many of the "fortuitous . . . accidental . . . occasional" cases, which Giddings<sup>55</sup> opposes to the "historical" cases, might disappear into the second class were it not for such advice.

<sup>51</sup> F. H. Giddings, *Inductive Sociology*, p. 9.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. the Italian romanticists. The controversy in theological circles raging about the miraculous element in the Gospels indicates the same protest.

<sup>53</sup> Quoted in Berr, *op. cit.*, p. 67 n. 3. For a detailed discussion of the nature of chance see *ibid.*, pp. 55-68.

<sup>54</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 267.

<sup>55</sup> *Scientific Study of Human Society*, p. 99.

It should also be remembered that there are sciences which are concerned with contingency, chance factors, as dominant. These sciences, such as meteorology and pathology, are no less scientific in their search to discover the limits of this area of contingency.<sup>56</sup> This is where a science of history must begin; but its task is not hopeless.

"But", interjects the relentless critic, "the type of contingency is different in history; for here you are dealing with contingencies of the human will, and these are infinitely indeterminate." Let one of England's clearest thinkers on the problems of human life make reply:

The difference which a true indeterminism of the will would introduce would be simply this, that while in other sciences all conditions might ultimately become known, in psychology and sociology there would always be something unknowable. There would, so to say, be a gap in the orderly sequence whenever the will came into play. . . . None the less, upon each side of the gap we could go on with our work, and all our generalisations would hold conditionally on the behaviour of the unknown factor. . . .

Now let us assume every single human will to be undetermined in the traditional libertarian sense. This must mean that in any given case it is equally probable that it would act in one way or in the opposite way. For if we deny this, the will is biased, and therefore at least partially determined. But when any result is unbiased by the known conditions, the probability that it will occur, and the probability that it will not occur, are equal. . . . Hence we arrive at two results. If the will has no definite and uniform direction, then operating among large numbers of persons, it will produce no sensible divergence from the results which would ensue if it did not operate at all. Conversely, if in human choice there is some preponderant tendency observed, that tendency is not unconditioned, but proceeds from determinate elements in the nature of the will itself. Hence in sociology the indeterminateness of the will, if true, does not affect the possibility of establishing laws of cause and effect, with an approximation to certainty and accuracy which advances with every increment of numbers.<sup>57</sup>

The blind march of events, so widely heralded by the indeterminists, he holds to be due not to absence of law but to lack of co-ordination of wills for a common end. Individual intelligence may be lost in mass blindness, but this is not a contradiction of law, but rather a law in itself.<sup>58</sup>

There is another aspect of the use of historical materials for scientific purposes which should not be overlooked. This is the method of sampling which occupies so important a position in the work of the statistician. It is "a process of enumeration restricted to a few units taken at different points in the field of investigation".<sup>59</sup>

<sup>56</sup> Berr, *op. cit.*, pp. 112 f.

<sup>57</sup> L. T. Hobhouse, *Social Development*, pp. 320 f.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 325 f.

<sup>59</sup> Langlois and Seignobos, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

We have here, then, a process of comparison—invidious comparison, many historians would call it! They would object to the suppression of individuality in the determination of norms. Ross's insistence that sociology "cancels out" the individual facts which history rightly cherishes<sup>60</sup> rests upon a lack of recognition of the new history with its accounts of the doings of nameless masses; and upon a misconception of the method of generalization. The individual item is not submerged when coefficients of correlation are established, for the very coefficients themselves measure not only the degree of resemblance but also the degree of divergence, that is, of individuality. "No set of abstractions will exhaust the individuality of a single thing", but "if we would know the residual individuality we must carry our work of comparison to the utmost completeness, and we can then tell what is over and what is significant."<sup>61</sup> There is room, therefore, for the study of both general and individual facts; and the importance of preserving the historical uniqueness of a given incident does not thereby preclude the validity of formulating general, durable facts.<sup>62</sup>

Turning now to the arguments of E. C. Lindeman against the reliability of causal relations in history, we may ask first how Professor Lindeman in his advocacy of observation of current group life can guarantee freedom from the tendency, which seems to him inevitable in practically all historical reasoning, to read into the data observed the predilections of the observer. While, again, he denies the possibility of the predictability of natural science in the realm of human conduct, this can not be taken as invalidating a science of history, for reasons already given; and even if the denial be given full weight it places the historical method in no worse a position than any other method of social science. His argument from the complexity of group mechanisms of conduct similarly holds true for all social research. When he complains against arbitrarily chopping up the social process into cycles of cause and effect or against isolating specific situations from the general social milieu, one must ask him what he means, then, by that "delimitation of the field of inquiry" of which he had previously spoken;<sup>63</sup> or else retort that he confuses all historical explanation with philosophy of history, that *bête noir* of the scientific historian. The closing sentence of his attack is astounding in its arbitrary removal of all such operations from "history" to

<sup>60</sup> See above.

<sup>61</sup> Hobhouse, *op. cit.*, p. 324.

<sup>62</sup> See Langlois and Seignobos, *op. cit.*, pp. 237 f. The principles governing the construction of such general formulae are listed *ibid.*, pp. 267-269. It is surprising that Robinson seems nowhere in his *New History* to recognize such procedure.

<sup>63</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

"social science": "What happens between action and reaction, cause and effect, means and ends, stimulus and response constitutes the search of the social scientist"!<sup>64</sup> It is just as if one should say to the biologist, "Your work can not present any chemical analysis of organic behavior; for when you try to trace the chemo-tropisms of protozoa or flora you are in the domain of the chemist"! The attitude of Professor S. J. Case is different:

when historical processes are viewed as facts of social evolution, they become amenable to laws of empirical investigation and so constitute a suitable subject for scientific inquiry. In fact, it is an established canon of the new history that he alone is historically minded in the true sense of the term who sees the happenings of the past in their proper genetic connections. To have real historical knowledge one must be familiar, not only with specific events, but also with the causal nexus underlying phenomena.<sup>65</sup>

It would seem here that Case is using the terms "genetic connections" and "causal nexus" interchangeably; and there are those who would object that the two must not be confused.

A useful suggestion is offered by M. M. Davis in his *Psychological Interpretations of Society*. He proposes supplanting the word "cause" by "conditions" in the interests of scientific terminology, since by "cause" we usually mean the most variable condition, and one whose presence or absence is necessary to the existence of the phenomenon. Thus social causation may be expounded only tentatively and with the admission of subjective bias; but the use of the term is valid for such a *necessary condition*.<sup>66</sup>

Karl Pearson worked out a formula for single correlation, and later Franz Boas has developed a method of multiple correlation so that complex factors can be brought together into statistical unity. But correlations do not establish causal relationships,<sup>67</sup> though correlations of antecedent with subsequent items in recurrent series create a prejudice in favor of causal relation. As a matter of fact, this is as far as science can go. It is fair to say that a scientific correlation of samples from history, giving series of events, may be considered an adequate basis for provisional statements of historical causation.

It has been assumed in the discussion up to this point that some hypothesis is used in approaching the historical data, both to delimit the area of research and to furnish a tentative tool for organizing the data. In reply to the charge of a *a priori* method we can only say that we *must* use *a priori* questions;<sup>68</sup> and that the intelligent use of the

<sup>64</sup> P. 45.

<sup>65</sup> *Journal of Religion*, I. 5.

<sup>66</sup> Pp. 217 ff.

<sup>67</sup> W. A. McCall, *How to Measure in Education*, p. 389.

<sup>68</sup> See Langlois and Seignobos, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

provisional hypothesis is the essence of scientific technic. The use of such hypotheses from current social phenomena to exploit historical resources serves also to bring history into the service of social control.

## II. *Does the method conform to good sociology?*

The sociologist who has seen any value in the preceding discussion has probably decided that we have brought the method of historical sociology entirely under the sway of history. But, assuming that he is still unconvinced of its significance for sociology, and is quite doubtful whether such an approach rightly belongs in a department of sociology, we must justify its existence as a sociological method. It is necessary first to understand what sociology is.

Sociology, as is now well known, was first used as a term by Comte, who conceived the idea of a great synthesis of all the studies having to do with human life under a crowning science bearing this name. Spencer, taking his cue from the startling theory of Darwin in the biological field, sought to apply that theory to the study of social evolution. Wundt<sup>69</sup> characterized the philosophical sociology of these two men as "absolutely nothing but a philosophy of history under a new name". Such theorizing as they indulged in was either too broad to be fertile in particular areas or else too narrow to be valid in a general field.<sup>70</sup> The breakdown of these "laws" of external control of human behavior led to Ward's conception of voluntary direction of social life towards ideals. This in turn begot an emphasis on description of social conduct "in terms of its resident human values"; but even here the subjective bias of the authors asserted itself in dogmatic pronouncements upon social processes.<sup>71</sup> It was little wonder that contemporary academic "neighbors" resented the airs of this parvenu, who laid claim to the entire neighborhood, patronizingly extending to the old residents the privilege of living under his benevolent eye! They retorted by ostracism and by meticulous care to make it quite clear to the world at large that he was no kin of theirs, and that they did not take him seriously.<sup>72</sup>

These attacks themselves betray the sense of uncomfortable closeness of appearances; and this was true, because sociology, taking its rise out of history, still dealt mainly with general historical cycles and trends, with Spencer's biological analogy providing a variation of the

<sup>69</sup> *Völkerpsychologie*, I. 5.

<sup>70</sup> H. Croly, Introduction to Lindeman, *op. cit.*, p. ix.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. ix-xiv.

<sup>72</sup> See Wundt, *op. cit.*, I. 6; Langlois and Seignobos, *op. cit.*, p. 218; Bernheim, *Lehrbuch*, p. 88; and Menger, *Untersuchungen*, etc., I. 11 f., quoted by A. W. Small, *Origins of Sociology*, pp. 209 f.

main theme. But, with the line of explanation moving into comparative history and ethnology, there inevitably arose deeper questions of historical parallelism, which led into human nature problems, thus becoming psychological.<sup>73</sup> As applied to group life this became collective psychology, and furnished the important trend in current sociology. At any rate, sociology has freed itself from the philosophy of history, and its claim to respect among the social sciences must rest upon its never relapsing into its earlier speculative bent.

But the new alliance with psychology was also fraught with dangers, not the least of these being that sociologists took over uncritically the materials and method of psychology and repeated most of its early mistakes.<sup>74</sup> Furthermore, there were already active in the field of history many interpreters who were using a collective psychological approach.<sup>75</sup> Meanwhile, the young science of sociology was beginning to yield its infantile desires for the whole world and for the newest toy, and taking adolescent thought concerning its serious vocation. The earlier reaction in this country against the over-systematized works of Ward led to intensive cultivation of special technics for social research. The all-too-simple "laws of imitation" of Tarde,<sup>76</sup> and the "homogeneity" of Le Bon, and the "likemindedness" of Giddings gave way to the careful work of Charles H. Cooley's *Human Nature and the Social Order*, *Social Organization*, and *Social Process*. Charles A. Ellwood, the author of *Sociology in its Psychological Aspects*, warned against too close a preoccupation with psychology:<sup>77</sup> "Sociology cannot content itself, as one author has well remarked, with being merely illustrated psychology; it must also be, at least in its final development, analyzed and compared history."

At the present time sociology has succeeded in delimiting its area of study and its possible technic.<sup>78</sup> A dean of American sociologists, and one of its leading methodologists, the late Professor Albion W. Small, recently defined the function of sociology as follows:<sup>79</sup> "a

<sup>73</sup> Park and Burgess, *Introduction*, p. 20. For the historical development of the psychological emphasis in sociology see M. M. Davis, *op. cit.*, ch. II.; H. E. Barnes, *History and Prospects of the Social Sciences*, pp. 319-324.

<sup>74</sup> A. G. A. Balz, *Basis of Social Theory*, pp. 3 ff.

<sup>75</sup> Barnes (*Am. Jour. Psych.*, XXX. 345) cites the following: at Leipzig, Lamprecht; in Italy, Ferrero; in France, Tarde, Lévy-Bruhl, Fouillée, Seignobos, Durkheim; at London, Marvin, Zimmern, Barker; and at Columbia University, Robinson and Shotwell.

<sup>76</sup> Properly harmonized with a democratic social philosophy by E. A. Ross.

<sup>77</sup> P. 52. Cf. his article in the *Historical Outlook*, XIV. (1923) 348.

<sup>78</sup> The classifications of types of sociology are no longer valid as given by Berr (*op. cit.*, p. 121 n.) and Mentz (*Deutsche Rundschau*, CCIII. 22 f.).

<sup>79</sup> *Origins of Sociology*, p. 348.



sociologist, properly speaking, is a man whose professional procedure consists in the discovery or analysis of categories of human group composition or reaction or behavior, or in the use of such categories as means of interpreting or controlling group situations." This definition has great value because of its comprehensiveness, which is secured without loss of being specific. It includes the older distinctions between static and dynamic sociology, allows for inter-group and intra-group behavior, and accords a place to both theoretical and applied sociology. At the same time it keeps the emphasis upon human group life as the object of study.

This question now is: Does the approach outlined at the beginning of this essay fall within this definition? We have already committed ourselves on many points of method in the first part of this discussion; and we have at the same time indicated the specific scientific method. In so far as the treatment of history there outlined yields adequate bases for the formulation of general principles of human group behavior it is essentially a sociological study.

The specific contributions which historical study of the type here presented may make to sociology are listed by a historian as follows:<sup>80</sup> (1) documentary evidence on institutions and activities studied; (2) appraisal of the validity of source materials (*i.e.*, case studies); (3) concrete data bearing on general social problems in history; and (4) checks upon dogmatic generalization. There is also the uniqueness of historical facts, which, by presenting variations, provides the adequate basis for a scientific testing of general laws;<sup>81</sup> and the breadth of data serves partially to take the place of that experimentation which in sociology is impossible.<sup>82</sup> To these uses should be added the fact that historical cases, being in the past, are capable of more impartial treatment, since the artificial detachment so difficult of achievement in current studies is here in large measure guaranteed at the outset.

If we look upon sociology in its aspect of a science of history, that is, a body and method of generalization from case studies in past reality, we have here a sound procedure. If again we look upon sociology in its research into current phenomena, then the truth is brought home to us that the roots of the present are deep in the past.

This last statement needs interpretation from the standpoint of sociology. Its first meaning is obvious: that the institutions of the present day are a growth which can not be properly understood apart from their historical development. The significance of this lies deeper, however, for the institution has two phases—a fundamental

<sup>80</sup> Mentz, *op. cit.*, pp. 25 ff.

<sup>81</sup> Hubert and Mauss, *Mélanges d'Histoire des Religions*, pp. xxxix-xl.

<sup>82</sup> J. O. Hertzler, *Am. Jour. Sociol.*, XXXI, 176 f.

purpose and an adaptive structure of organization. Now all critical study of institutions demands an intimate knowledge of both of these; and the secret of such knowledge lies in the study of their history. Furthermore, the institution is only the objective manifestation of group attitudes, and the socially inherited attitudes are best revealed by the institution's history.<sup>83</sup> Not all social attitudes are built up around institutions, unless all established values (such as *mores*) be called institutions; but every social attitude has a corresponding social value, around which the wishes of the group have been organized. The real significance of the attitude or of the value as a current social phenomenon can not be fully grasped until the wishes are revealed. This again is a historic process; a story of the rise and growing prestige of the value as the embodiment of group desires.

Perhaps there is still confusion as to the distinctions between history and sociology. One negative statement may be made at the outset to clear the ground: there is no distinction on the basis of the data used. Botany may specialize in plant life as distinct from zoology which deals with animal life, but no such line can be drawn between history and sociology. Both deal with facts of human social life. History and sociology both draw a distinction between past reality and current events, but both sciences seek to deal with both classes of data. The principle of demarcation is to be sought, therefore, not in the materials studied, but in the method and aims of research.

History is essentially a descriptive science, seeking to set down accurately the events as they occurred. To accomplish this purpose, history needs an exact technic for discrimination of evidence, and at this point, thanks to the work of methodologists like Seignobos and Bernheim, the science of history has well earned its title. But the accurate description of events involves more than the sifting of evidence and the collection of data; it demands also a technic for tracing sequences of events. Now, the development of rigorous logic has compelled us to reject as fallacious the argument: *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, and accordingly chronological cataloguing has lost much of its force. The thread of sequence is now sought in genetic relationship. But this can be established only on the basis of some hypothesis of development. Before the growth of social science, comparative ethnology, and, especially, objective psychology, such hypotheses were perforce speculative and general, and hence the earlier vogue of philosophy of history, which was the tracing of development in history, but on broad, general, crude lines. With the

<sup>83</sup> Cf. Case, *loc. cit.*, p. 7. See C. H. Cooley, *Social Organization*, pt. V.

increase of detailed data and the greater perfection of observational technic in social science it has become possible to provide the historian with theories of development in more detailed processes. In so far, therefore, as more particularistic theories are available, the historian should be equipped to trace genetic relationships in more detail and with greater exactness. The work of the descriptive science of history is therefore refined and augmented by the tools which the related sciences have developed.

Sociology is an analytical science, seeking to resolve the social data observed into laws of cause and effect. Obviously its data, in so far as they need accurate recording, are secured from two sources: data concerning present social behavior, from the social survey technician; data of past reality, from the historian. Just as lack of data needed for the explanation of current group behavior is a challenge to the social surveyor, so the lack of data for explanation of past group behavior presents its challenge to the historical researcher. But the accumulation of data must be followed by classification and the development of hypotheses; and until such hypotheses have been reached the work of the sociologist is not complete. Thus the two conditions of a sound sociological method are: accurate description and careful theorization. These two conditions are mutually necessary: description involves evaluation of data in terms of their significance, and here a guiding hypothesis is needed;<sup>84</sup> careful theorization must be "true to the facts" and here accurate description is absolutely essential. Accordingly, history and sociology are auxiliary arms of social science, in the same sense that police and judiciary are auxiliary: their functions are quite distinct though the material they handle is the same.

### III. *Social psychology as liaison.*

The distrust which marked the historian's attitude toward sociology has been strikingly lacking in his treatment of psychology. Seignobos, whose view of sociology we have noted above, stated that "history is based upon psychology", and devoted a lengthy monograph to *The Psychological Conditions of Historical Knowledge*.<sup>85</sup> Bernheim, with characteristic discrimination, acknowledged the value of social psychology for history;<sup>86</sup> while Wundt<sup>87</sup> and Lamprecht<sup>88</sup>

<sup>84</sup> "Facts chosen without any choice, without any guiding principle, cannot possibly help us. Facts are like valets: they cannot talk unless first addressed by their master—the idea." Emil Reich, *Fortnightly Review* (n. s.), LXXVII. 103.

<sup>85</sup> "Les Conditions Psychologiques de la Connaissance en Histoire", *Revue Philosophique*, XXIV. 1-32, 168-179.

<sup>86</sup> *Lehrbuch*, pp. 600, 610 ff.

<sup>87</sup> *Völkerpsychologie*, I. 3.

<sup>88</sup> *What is History?* p. 29.

went even further in their acclaim. Emil Reich insisted continually upon the importance of psychology as "the comprehension of the ultimate motives of men and women in submitting themselves to an institution, in enacting an event . . .".<sup>89</sup> Berr, the French historical methodologist, lists psychology as part of the historian's necessary equipment.<sup>90</sup>

It is necessary to distinguish social psychology from folk psychology on the one hand and from individual psychology on the other. The German philologists Lazarus and Steinhal, who created and christened folk psychology, projected their idea of a collective mind under philosophic influence.<sup>91</sup> Wundt, whose two-volume work popularized the name and the study, derived his categories from parallelism with individual psychology.<sup>92</sup> The reliance of collective psychology upon individual psychology has been variously appraised as a handicap<sup>93</sup> and as its only hope of salvation from "entertaining but irrelevant excursions into history and sociology".<sup>94</sup> With the researches of Durkheim and Lévy-Bruhl in France, Cooley, W. I. Thomas, and R. E. Park in America, and Sighele in Italy has come a clearer understanding of the distinct field of the psychology of the group as group.<sup>95</sup> Such studies concentrate upon the *behavior* of groups.<sup>96</sup> This behavior is recognized as having two manifestations: the organic responses of the individuals composing the group, and the interrelations of the individuals within the group; but these are only two angles of observation and not two bodies of data. A reconciliation of the antagonism between individual and collective psychologists might be effected, as Balz<sup>97</sup> suggests, by common acceptance of the concept of behavior; or, as Lindeman<sup>98</sup> proposes, by distinguishing

<sup>89</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 104, 108.

<sup>90</sup> *La Synthèse en Histoire*, pp. 237 f. See also S. Mathews, *Spiritual Interpretation of History*, pp. 7, 32; S. J. Case, *Jour. Relig.*, I. 6, 7; J. M. Vincent, *op. cit.*, p. 278; Teggart, *Processes of History*, ch. III.

<sup>91</sup> M. M. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 28. See also Herder's *Ideen zur Geschichte der Menschheit*.

<sup>92</sup> G. S. Brett, *A History of Psychology*, p. 292.

<sup>93</sup> A. G. A. Balz, *Basis of Social Theory*, p. 3.

<sup>94</sup> Brett, *op. cit.*, p. 296. It is not without significance that Brett's history of social psychology omits all mention of Cooley, Sighele, Hubert, and Mauss.

<sup>95</sup> E. Durkheim, *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*; Lévy-Bruhl, *Les Fonctions Mentales dans les Sociétés Inférieures*; Cooley, *op. cit.*; Thomas and Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant*; Park, *Masse und Publikum*; S. Sighele, *La Foule Criminelle*.

<sup>96</sup> Others, however, still preserve the earlier dualism of mind and body in a search for a "social mind" or a "group soul", as something apart from the individuals composing the group.

<sup>97</sup> *Op. cit.*, ch. I.

<sup>98</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

between *behavior* as organic and *conduct* as social and dividing the field accordingly.

It might be more acceptable to both groups, however, to speak of *interaction* as the common denominator. This concept describes what is the basis of all psychic life; nay more, the human is perforce the interacting, and the study of human life must be the study of interaction either with physical objects or with social objects. Social objects are those which are regarded by the agent as either responding or capable of response, and to which, accordingly, his actions are adjusted in terms of his conception of his significance for them (*i.e.*, self-consciousness). The behavior of a group is not different in amount from the sum of individual reactions, but these reactions are affected qualitatively by the presence of a multiplicity of social objects introducing a new series of stimuli in the milieu.

By virtue of this fact, we have therefore a definite branch of sociology which may concern itself with the peculiarities of human reactions under various conditions of collectivity. This may be called collective psychology, on account of its preoccupation with the differentiae of *collective* behavior, waiving the controversy of individual versus social psychology.<sup>99</sup> The task now becomes to study the mechanisms of interaction within groups, with special reference to the processes which are found to be concomitant with association of humans in collective activity. Such a study is definitely sociological.

Now it is just at this point of the psychic reactions of human beings in groups that social psychology finds its contact with history. Repeatedly in history we find attempts to combine significant data on historic group situations frustrated by the historian's lack of knowledge of collective psychology. Recourse is had to common-sense judgments or introspection or some uncritical psychological analogy as the explanatory medium. For instance take the method of historical reasoning as outlined by Seignobos:

This reasoning implies as major premise a general principle by induction from experience, as minor premise an analogy established between the document and contemporary manifestations observed at first hand. The induction takes its rise in experience, it binds the historical datum to present knowledge; the analogy is drawn from examination of the document, it binds the datum to past reality.<sup>100</sup>

Here the difficulty of the historian lies in his lack of a major premise (*i.e.*, "a general principle by induction from experience") which is

<sup>99</sup> The two sciences need each other too much to quarrel. The "collective" psychologist needs to know the organisms which compose the group; and what reactions are *peculiar* to collective situations. The "individual" psychologist needs light on such socially modified responses; and, for experimental purposes, a knowledge of the effects of his own presence upon the reactions of his subject.

<sup>100</sup> *Rev. Phil.*, XXIV. 28.

free from inept crudity or subjective bias. Inasmuch as the situations of history are social situations (only such have been preserved except in biography, and even here the "person" is a social product and a function of collective behavior) collective psychology may be presumed to furnish the key to such reasoning.

But we may even go further, and point out that history depends upon a knowledge of collective behavior for its social usefulness. Thus W. I. Thomas writes:<sup>101</sup>

We live in an entirely new world, unique, without parallel in history. History has not helped us. It cannot help us, because we do not understand it. . . . We must first understand the past from the present. We must view the present as behavior. We must establish by scientific procedure the laws of behavior, and then the past will have its meaning and make its contribution.

This comports well with the admission of historians, already cited, that the one constant factor in history is human psychic reactions.

So little has yet been done in this field that patience will be demanded for the slow achievement of the socio-analyst of history, handicapped as he is by lack of the necessary data in authoritative histories; but eventually scientific consecration will yield its practical results. The advice of Professor Giddings is here appropriate:

To the scientific mind the universe is order; to the practical mind it is possibility. Both minds, however, know that order and possibility are compatible; it is only the mind that is neither practical nor scientific which imagines that they are not. Therefore, the scientific mind is under logical obligation to show how order accommodates possibility, and the practical mind, if wise, will wish to know what bounds are set to possibility by order. These intellectual requirements bear particularly upon those specialized investigators who undertake to find an order, admitting of description in categories of cause and law, in the practical activities themselves of all sorts and conditions of men.<sup>102</sup>

EDWIN E. AUBREY.

<sup>101</sup> In *Suggestions of Modern Science concerning Education*, p. 196.

<sup>102</sup> *Studies in the Theory of Human Society*, p. 127.

*Politic and History*  
*History*

## GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY, 1904-1906

IN 1898 Bülow hailed his imperial master as the future "arbiter mundi".<sup>1</sup> Five years later the optimistic Chancellor, while somewhat chastened, was still confident that Germany would soon be the pivot of European diplomacy.<sup>2</sup> By 1907 this expectation had faded and William II. surveying the altered diplomatic scene exclaimed in impotent wrath: "The encirclement continues quietly its unalterable progress!"<sup>3</sup> The story of this shift in the balance of power has been told many times, but the reaction of the Wilhelmstrasse to the Entente Cordiale has received no detailed treatment since the appearance of the invaluable material made available during the past decade. In the broad surveys of European diplomacy which have recently appeared the origin and nature of German diplomacy from 1904 to 1906 remain obscure. This disappointing result may be attributed in part to the fact that attention has usually been focussed on specific problems rather than on the general situation which confronted the Wilhelmstrasse, but even more misleading is the assumption frequently made that the Berlin government was pursuing a consistent foreign policy. A consistent policy predicates unity of purpose and action. During the period under discussion neither of these essential elements was present in German diplomacy. At no time after 1890 does the direction of German foreign relations show the unity of control which marked the Bismarckian period. Division of power did not lead to acute friction for some years, however, because complacent confidence in the secure position of Germany made for a spirit of toleration between the members of the group directing affairs; in view of the inevitable hegemony of the Central Powers it was felt that divergent policies, even indiscreet speech or action, could do little harm.

At the end of 1903, however, the international situation began to crystallize with a rapidity which produced chaos in German policy. In November, Lord Lansdowne hinted that France and England were about to adjust their differences.<sup>4</sup> Italy gave increasing evidence that

<sup>1</sup> Bülow to William II., Aug. 24, 1898. *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette* (Berlin, 1922-1926, 39 vols.), XIV. 339-342. In subsequent notes this collection will be referred to as *G. P.*

<sup>2</sup> Holstein to Bülow, Apr. 16, 1903, concurring in the ideas expressed in a private letter from Bülow. *Ibid.*, XVIII. 68-70.

<sup>3</sup> Miquel to Bülow, Oct. 9, 1907, comment of William II. *Ibid.*, XXV. 47, 48.

<sup>4</sup> Metternich to Bülow, Nov. 26, 1903. *Ibid.*, XVII. 362, 363.



no aid could be expected from her against this new combination. Russia and Japan stood on the verge of war. In the effort to meet these new conditions there developed a three-cornered struggle for control of German foreign policy which ended in 1906 with the dismissal of Holstein, the physical collapse of Bülow, and the isolation of Germany.

This clash of wills, and the consequent instability of policy, are the most significant factors in German diplomacy from 1904 to 1906. They have not received adequate recognition. Seymour sees in the Moroccan crisis merely a blow for prestige; Gooch more dispassionately concludes that "Bülow had had a good hand, but had played it badly"; Dillon stigmatizes Björkö as the work of a cheap trickster.<sup>5</sup> All of these judgments contain certain elements of truth, but for the actors themselves the problem was not so simple; each episode was for them merely part of a general situation with which they were trying to cope. The makers of German foreign policy had one feeling in common—fear, at times half-apprehended, sometimes almost submerged beneath revived self-confidence, but rising again to abject terror. They saw the evil machinations of Edward VII. gradually, almost inexorably, arraying the whole Continent against Germany. The Wilhelmstrasse was united in a determination to tear through this web. On the question of means by which their common end might be attained, however, there was no such unity, and it is only by an understanding of the divergent points of view of William II., Bülow, and Holstein that the events of this period can be correctly interpreted.

In the following pages an effort will be made to re-create the events of the years from 1904 to 1906 as seen through the eyes of these three complex personalities. The task is incapable of perfect execution; any solution must be at best only tentative. The mere statement of the problem is, nevertheless, of value. For as a result of the situation existing in the Wilhelmstrasse, German policy during these years was a tissue of inconsistencies, of expedients half-tried, and of failures.

## I.

The apparent inactivity of Germany during the months following the conclusion of the Anglo-French Entente has long seemed puzzling. In reality this outward immobility was largely the result of a deadlock of opinion within the government. In the Reichstag, Bülow concealed his real views by the urbanity and wit which had always

<sup>5</sup> Charles Seymour, *The Diplomatic Background of the War* (New Haven, 1916), p. 170; G. P. Gooch, *History of Modern Europe* (New York, 1923), p. 368; E. J. Dillon, *The Eclipse of Russia* (New York, 1918), pp. 405, 414.

been his greatest political asset, seeking to dispel the popular fear of isolation by affecting a calm indifference towards the union of the Western Powers. He even professed to see in the Entente a guaranty of peace.<sup>6</sup> In reality, however, the uneasiness of public opinion was reflected in official circles. Bülow and William II. admitted that the positions of both France and England were improved by their agreement, and that Italian loyalty could no longer be counted on.<sup>7</sup> Even greater dangers loomed in the future. The political leaders of France and England were frank in their determination to bring Russia into the Entente;<sup>8</sup> this accomplished, Germany and Austria were encircled. The secret articles of the Anglo-French treaties were another source of uneasiness and gave rise to extravagant rumors;<sup>9</sup> the General Staff was asked for an opinion on the possibility of a German victory in the event of an early war.<sup>10</sup> On the gravity of the situation the government was agreed, but in the discussion of ways and means by which Germany might be rescued from isolation wide divergence of opinion appeared. Three solutions were offered, the first fathered by William II., the others by Holstein. Despite repeated disappointments, the Kaiser held fast to the conviction that the balance of power might be restored by a union of the Triple and Dual Alliances. Holstein denied both the wisdom and the possibility of a Continental *bloc*. With that curious combination of penetrating discernment and wilful blindness which makes his character so difficult to analyze, he reasserted the ideas of *Machtpolitik* which had failed so dismally a decade earlier, at the time of the Jameson Raid. His first proposal was pacific enough—to nullify the importance of the Entente by securing similar agreements with France and England. When this failed, however, he fell back on force; France must be convinced that her friendship with England was not only useless in the face of German opposition, but actually dangerous. The position

<sup>6</sup> Mem. of Bülow, Apr. 9, 1904, urging that the press adopt a calm attitude towards the Entente (*G. P.* XX. 12); speech of Apr. 12, in the Reichstag (*Fürst Bülows Reden*, Berlin, 1907-1909, II. 73, 74); speech of Apr. 14, ridiculing fear of isolation (*G. P.* pp. 84, 85). Bülow to Hammann, urging that the press take a more moderate tone; Hammann, *Bilder aus der Letzten Kaiserzeit* (Berlin, 1922), pp. 42, 43.

<sup>7</sup> William II. to Bülow, Apr. 19, 1904; Bülow to William II., Apr. 20. *G. P.*, XX. 22-24.

<sup>8</sup> Monts to Bülow, Apr. 26, 1904. *Ibid.*, XX. 26.

<sup>9</sup> Bülow to Metternich, June 4, 1904, and latter's reply; Metternich to Foreign Office, June 19. *Ibid.*, XX. 27-30.

<sup>10</sup> Mem. of Lichnowsky, interview with Schlieffen, Apr. 19, 1904; Schlieffen to Bülow, Apr. 20. *Ibid.*, XIX. 174-177. The anxiety of the Wilhelmstrasse about the secret articles makes Grey's comments (*Twenty-five Years*, N. Y., 1925, I. 49, 50) seem almost ironical.

of Bülow is not easy to determine, not only because many of the despatches signed with his name were undoubtedly the work of others, but also because he frequently shifted his ground. During 1904, however, his views coincided with Holstein's.

At the end of 1903, when it became apparent that France, Italy, Spain, and England were uniting by a series of interlocking agreements, William II. launched his campaign to restore the balance of power. His immediate objective was a Russo-German alliance; ultimately, he hoped to win France also, and thus to unite the Continent against England. The situation in the Far East was to be the force propelling Russia towards the Central Powers. He was convinced that if Russia should become involved in war, she must depend more and more on Germany since France was moving rapidly towards England, the ally of Japan. Faced with isolation, Russia would be driven into the arms of Germany. William II., accordingly, strove earnestly to nerve the "weak, idealistic, ridiculously pacific and unmilitary" Tsar for the coming conflict with Japan. In his personal correspondence with Nicholas II. insinuations against England and France—"The Crimean Combination"—were mingled with rumors of Japanese preparations for war and exhortations to stand firm in the defense of legitimate Russian interests in the Far East.<sup>11</sup> To himself and his advisers the Kaiser justified a course which seemed to contradict his often proclaimed love of peace by arguing that the conflict in the Far East was no mere scramble for territory. Russia was the defender of Western civilization and Christianity, while for Japan the stakes were supremacy in the Far East and the ultimate triumph of the yellow race. "The side which every European capable of thought must take is self-evident." If Russia surrendered, "in twenty years the yellow race will be in Poland and Posen". Surrender, moreover, would be disastrous for the monarchical principle; the cowardice and blunders of Nicholas II., the Kaiser contended, were giving powerful weapons to radical agitators.<sup>12</sup>

The Russophile policy of William II., and more especially his attempts to spur Nicholas II. to action, met with determined opposition from Bülow and Holstein. They felt that an alliance with Russia would rather weaken than strengthen the position of Germany. Such

<sup>11</sup> Bülow to William II., Jan. 12, 1904, comment of the latter; Arco to Foreign Office, Jan. 13, comment of William II.; William II. to Nicholas II., June 6, 1904. *G. P.*, XIX. 26-28, 186. William II. to Nicholas II., Sept. 19, Dec. 4, 1903, and Jan. 3 and 9, 1904, *The Kaiser's Letters to the Czar*, ed. I. D. Levine (N. Y., 1920), pp. 91-93, 95-103.

<sup>12</sup> Arco to For. Off., Jan. 13, 1904, comments of William II.; mem. of Bülow, Feb. 14, 1904, conversation with William II. *G. P.*, XIX. 27, 28, 62, 63.

an alliance could be directed only against England, and in case of a war against that power, Russia might be successful, but Germany must inevitably suffer the loss of her commerce and her navy. The possibility of an English attack on Germany seemed for the moment remote, but England and Russia might come to blows at any time. Why, they argued, seek an alliance which offered no security and a great deal of danger?<sup>13</sup> Holstein also contended that Russia could never be won to an alliance with Germany, since the Dual Alliance was admittedly still prized in St. Petersburg, where the "indispensable preliminary" to any Russo-German agreement—a mutual guaranty of territory—would be regarded as an attempt to alienate France from her ally. The result would be a rebuff to Germany.<sup>14</sup>

Despite the arguments of his advisers, William II. continued his efforts to foster Russo-German friendship. For a time he believed that an agreement to neutralize Danish territorial waters might serve as the entering wedge for a general alliance. Bülow's objections were met with the argument that this agreement would double German naval strength, and thereby afford protection against the aggressive designs of England.<sup>15</sup> The Chancellor reluctantly agreed to open negotiations, but Holstein soon discovered a device which checkmated the Kaiser's plans. Nicholas II. suggested that the treaty of neutralization be drawn up by Germany. Here, suggested Holstein, was a means of testing the sincerity of Russia and Denmark. If the treaty were drafted in Berlin, Germany might be represented in London and Washington as the originator of the plan. Nicholas II. must ask Denmark, as the most interested party, to make the first written proposal. William II. accepted this suggestion. As the Danish king was afraid to move lest England be offended, the whole project collapsed in February, 1904, to the relief of the Wilhelmstrasse.<sup>16</sup> The indiscreet correspondence of William II. and the Tsar continued, however, and in his efforts to moderate the tone of these messages

<sup>13</sup> Mem. of Richthofen, July 4 (*circa*), 1904; *G. P.*, XIX. 194-196. Mem. of Holstein, Dec. 23, 1903; *ibid.*, XIX. 73-77. As early as 1902 the Wilhelmstrasse had sought to commit Germany to a policy of neutrality in the impending struggle. This attitude was reaffirmed in 1903. Memoranda of Holstein, Mar. 24 and July 2, 1902; mem. of Mühlberg, July 15, 1903; Mühlberg to Arco, Oct. 26, 1903. *Ibid.*, XIX. 3-7, 10-12, 15.

<sup>14</sup> Mem. of Holstein, Jan. 23, 1904. *Ibid.*, XIX. 48-52.

<sup>15</sup> Bülow to Schoen, Nov. 13, 1903; William II. to Nicholas II., Dec. 15, 1903. *Ibid.*, XIX. 67-70, 84-87. Comments of William II., Dec. 27, 1903, on a despatch from Bülow. Metternich and Sternburg opposed the plan on the ground that England and the United States would be antagonized. Metternich and Speck von Sternburg to For. Off., Dec. 23 and 26, 1903. *Ibid.*, XIX. 78-82.

<sup>16</sup> Mem. of Holstein, Dec. 23, 1903; Bülow to William II., Dec. 27. *Ibid.*, XIX. 73-77, 82-84.

Bülow was unsuccessful. His protests were finally silenced by the Kaiser's blunt statement that his "private correspondence" with Nicholas II. was not subject to the supervision of the Foreign Office.<sup>17</sup> Even the efforts of the German government to maintain neutrality in the Far Eastern dispute were a source of constant irritation to William II. "I *know well*", he asserted, "that some day we shall have to be engaged in a *life or death struggle* with Japan. . . . The most far-reaching benevolent neutrality towards Russia! She will help us later against the Japs!"<sup>18</sup>

The Kaiser's first attempt to realize his scheme for an alliance with Russia had failed. Bülow and Holstein now turned their attention to the problems raised by the Entente. Could this be nullified, or, even better, be converted into an instrument by which the relations between Germany and the Western Powers might be improved? Holstein believed this to be possible, but in any case he was determined that Germany should not sit passively by while England and France settled problems in which Germany was interested.<sup>19</sup> Forewarned by Lansdowne of the impending Anglo-French agreement, the Wilhelmstrasse set out to pave the way for a similar agreement between Berlin and Paris. The suggestion that William II. and President Loubet meet in Italy was eagerly seized on, but the French government held back.<sup>20</sup> Bülow then proposed that claims for damages against Morocco be pressed in order to demonstrate German interest in that country.<sup>21</sup> Here he ran afoul of William II., who felt that friction with France over Morocco would endanger his plan for a Continental alliance. Before the Wilhelmstrasse could take action, he assured the King of Spain in March, 1904, that Germany wished no Moroccan territory.<sup>22</sup> This declaration placed Bülow and Holstein in a difficult position, not that they cared greatly for Morocco in itself, but because the Kaiser's statement made it more difficult to use the problem as a means of exerting pressure on France.

<sup>17</sup> William II. to Nicholas II., Nov. 19, 1904, on English plans in Afghanistan; Bülow to William II., Jan. 4, 1904, comment of latter. *Ibid.*, XIX. 393, 394, 87-89.

<sup>18</sup> Arco to Bülow, Aug. 11, 1904 (received Sept. 9), comment of William II. *Ibid.*, XIX. 210-212.

<sup>19</sup> Memoranda of Holstein, Apr. 19 and June 3. *Ibid.*, XX. 123, 124, 207-209.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, XX. 105-119.

<sup>21</sup> Bülow to William II., Mar. 30, urging armed action against Morocco; Tschirschky to Bülow, Apr. 3, veto of William II. *Ibid.*, XX. 197-201.

<sup>22</sup> William II. to Bülow, Mar. 16, 1904; Radowitz to Richthofen, Mar. 23—efforts to induce William II. to change his stand had been unavailing. *Ibid.*, XVII. 363, 364. Cf. also Eckardstein, who states that William II. had informed Edward VII. at Kiel that Morocco had never interested him. *Die Isolierung Deutschlands* (Leipzig, 1921), pp. 87, 88.

In his public declarations on the Entente, Bülow had stated that there was no reason to suppose that German interests in Morocco would be disregarded.<sup>23</sup> As a matter of fact the Wilhelmstrasse felt that the frequent linking of Morocco and Tunis in French colonial discussions gave the lie to this hope, and the conviction was general that Germany must act quickly or be confronted with the *fait accompli* of a French protectorate.<sup>24</sup> The attitude of William II., however, compelled Bülow to move cautiously. At first he contented himself with aiding Spain to secure from France recognition of her claim to a part of Morocco. He was impelled to this action not only by the hope of winning the gratitude of Spain and by the thought that at a later date Spain might surrender part of her gains to Germany, but also by the desire to show the potential force of German opposition to France.<sup>25</sup> As the Spanish negotiations neared completion and Delcassé still showed no desire to discuss the Moroccan question with Berlin, Bülow sought more direct means of demonstrating German interest. After much discussion he recommended in August, 1904, that an ultimatum be sent to Fez demanding compensation for damages to German subjects. If the Sultan refused to yield, a naval demonstration might be tried. The legality of such a plan of action would preclude objections from other powers, and France might be aroused to the necessity of opening negotiations with Berlin. This proposal, like earlier ones of a similar nature, was promptly vetoed by the Kaiser as too adventurous, and likely to give offense to France. The Wilhelmstrasse gave way, and until the end of the year discussion of the Moroccan question practically ceased.<sup>26</sup>

Deep division within the German government had paralyzed German diplomacy in its dealings with Russia and France during the spring and summer of 1904. No such differences hampered negotiations with England. The complacent conviction of British decadence which had prompted the rebuff of British advances a few years earlier had been replaced by a realization of the necessity for conciliating the first naval power of the world.<sup>27</sup> When the British government communicated to Berlin the public clauses regarding Egypt in the Anglo-

<sup>23</sup> Speech of Apr. 12, in Reichstag. *Fürst Bülow's Reden*, II. 73, 74.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *Temps*, Apr. 4, and *London Times*, June 6, 14, 17. Mem. of Bruning, Apr. 23, 1904, with marginal comments of Richthofen. *G. P.*, XX. 203-205.

<sup>25</sup> Bülow to Radowitz, Apr. 29; Bülow to Metternich, May 31. *Ibid.*, XX. 169, 170, 176, 177.

<sup>26</sup> Bülow to Radolin, July 21, 1904; mem. of Richthofen, July 29; Mühlberg to Bülow, Aug. 16; Bülow to Tschirschky, Aug. 17; mem. of Richthofen, for Bülow, Oct. 7. *Ibid.*, XX. 210-214, 217, 223-225, 228-230.

<sup>27</sup> Bülow to William II., July 19, 1904; Bernstorff to Bülow, Apr. 16, an analysis of Anglo-German relations, approved by Bülow and William II. *Ibid.*, XIX. 196-204, XX. 14-21.

French treaty, Holstein suggested that a similar agreement be concluded between England and Germany.<sup>28</sup> This proposal met with a courteous but very firm rebuff from Lansdowne, who consented to a guaranty of existing German privileges in Egypt only after an acrimonious exchange of notes.<sup>29</sup> Undaunted, the Kaiser and his advisers redoubled their efforts to win the friendship of England. Edward VII. was given an enthusiastic reception during his visit to Kiel; a German squadron visited Plymouth; and on July 12 an arbitration treaty was concluded between the two countries. The gain, Metternich reported, was negligible.<sup>30</sup> The over-friendly welcome accorded Edward VII. by the German press was branded by the *Times* as "tasteless and vain". The same journal hinted that the German war-ships had been sent to Plymouth to spy on the defenses of the city, and ridiculed efforts to attach importance to the treaty of arbitration.<sup>31</sup>

The cold hostility of England and the sphinx-like silence of Delcassé convinced the Wilhelmstrasse that the Entente was directed against Germany. The unconcealed desire of Edward VII. to effect a rapprochement with Russia heightened this apprehension. "Germany's prestige has declined in recent years", wrote Holstein, "and our opponents and rivals are forming a ring around us. Difficult times are, therefore, to be expected."<sup>32</sup> His solution of the problem, determined opposition to France in Morocco, was precluded by the Kaiser's attitude. In desperation he and Bülow embraced for a time the plan of William II. to secure an alliance with Russia.

The Dogger Bank episode and the protests of England against the coaling of Russian ships by Germany offered an excuse for reopening negotiations with Nicholas II. On October 27, 1904, William II. informed the Tsar that the difficulties which might result from the coaling problem could be met only by a Russo-German alliance. As France, in spite of the Anglophile tendencies of Delcassé, must follow her ally, the result would be a combination of the three strongest Continental powers.<sup>33</sup> Nicholas II. professed sympathy for the idea,

<sup>28</sup> Mem. of Holstein, Apr. 19. *Ibid.*, XX. 123, 124.

<sup>29</sup> Villiers to Lascelles, May 24, copy given to the German Foreign Office, May

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, XX. 129-131. For the dispute over the Egyptian question, cf. *ibid.*, XX. 133-157.

<sup>30</sup> During the Kiel visit Edward VII. denied the necessity for an Anglo-German entente, but expressed the desire for improved relations. Mem. of Bülow, June 26, *ibid.*, XIX. 186-188. Cf. despatch of Metternich, *ibid.*, XIX. 194, n. 4.

<sup>31</sup> London *Times*, June 24 and 25, and July 4 and 14.

<sup>32</sup> Holstein to Hammann, July 11, 1904. Hammann, *Bilder*, p. 33.

<sup>33</sup> William II. to Nicholas II., Oct. 27, 1904. *G. P.*, XIX. 303, 304.



and at his suggestion a treaty was drawn up by Bülow.<sup>34</sup> William II. realized fully the burden he was assuming for his country. At the height of the Dogger Bank crisis he wrote: "This evening, to-night, or early to-morrow may well see the opening of a terrible drama, with incalculable results. May God be with us! I am desperately worried."<sup>35</sup> Such sincerity did not, apparently, exist in St. Petersburg, where the conclusion of the treaty was deferred on one pretext or another until the danger of war with England was past. Then the Tsar refused to sign until France had been told.<sup>36</sup> William II. felt that the acceptance of this condition was obviously impossible; Delcassé would immediately warn London. As Russia stood fast, all hope of agreement gradually disappeared. "The situation is coming to resemble more and more that preceding the Seven Years' War", wrote William II. "The first failure I have personally experienced! Let us hope it is not the prelude to a series of similar episodes!"<sup>37</sup>

The depression in Berlin was heightened by the repercussion across the Channel of the negotiations with St. Petersburg. The efforts of Germany to conciliate Russia were apparent to all, and calculated Russian indiscretion brought the Kaiser's proposed alliance to the attention of the British press.<sup>38</sup> Hatred and suspicion of Germany flared up anew in England, and the German press replied in kind. In both countries fear of attack reached hysterical proportions.<sup>39</sup> On one pretext or another the scattered units of the German fleet were called to home waters.<sup>40</sup> In December, 1904, almost the whole staff of the London embassy was summoned to Berlin for a series of conferences. These discussions emphasized the intensity of English suspicion of Germany, and the possibility that even a minor incident might lead to war. Little hope was held out for an improvement in Anglo-German relations. Reluctantly, and with full

<sup>34</sup> Nicholas II. to William II., Oct. 29; Bülow to William II., Oct. 30, expressing enthusiasm for the proposed alliance, and enclosing a draft treaty. *G. P.*, XIX. 305-308. William II. to Nicholas II., Nov. 17. *Letters from the Kaiser to the Czar*, pp. 133-137.

<sup>35</sup> William II. to Bülow, Nov. 1, 1904. *G. P.*, XIX. 290.

<sup>36</sup> Nicholas II. to William II., Nov. 23. *Ibid.*, XIX. 317.

<sup>37</sup> William II. to Bülow, Nov. 23; Nicholas II. to William II., Dec. 25; William II. to Bülow, Dec. 28. *Ibid.*, XIX. 316, 317, 346, 347.

<sup>38</sup> Eckardstein, *Isolierung*, p. 95. Alvensleben to Bülow, Dec. 26, 1904. *G. P.*, XIX. 374, 375.

<sup>39</sup> Metternich to Bülow, Nov. 1; mem. of Bülow, Nov. 4, conversation with Lascelles; report of Coerper (naval attaché in London), Nov. 18; mem. of Holstein, Dec. 5. *Ibid.*, XIX. 291-294, 296, 297, 353-356, 358, 359. Cf. speech of Bülow, Dec. 5; *Reden*, II. 124.

<sup>40</sup> Mem. of Richthofen, Nov. 30. *G. P.*, XIX. 356, 357.

recognition of the dangers involved, each diplomat questioned admitted that an alliance with Russia seemed the only means of ending the isolation of Germany.<sup>41</sup> But athwart the path to a union of the Triple and Dual Alliances stood the implacable Delcassé. In the opening months of 1905 the division in the German government seemed ended; all were united in the conviction that Delcassé must go.

## II.

The policy of Germany during 1904 had been confessedly a failure. The attempts of William II. to secure an alliance with Russia, and Holstein's effort to win a place in the Entente for Germany had been fruitless. In the Kaiser's words, the Triple Alliance was in fragments, because of the defection of Italy; and Russia was indifferent, England hostile, France bent on revenge for 1871.<sup>42</sup> The German government believed that Delcassé was largely responsible for this situation. His policy after Fashoda had made possible the Entente Cordiale; he had drawn Italy away from her allies; and his influence barred a rapprochement between the Triple and Dual Alliances. If Delcassé should fall, Bülow maintained, the "iron ring" which Edward VII. was forging around Germany would disappear.<sup>43</sup> It was this argument alone which induced William II. to abandon his conciliatory policy and embark halfheartedly on Holstein's perilous programme of smashing the Entente by force.<sup>44</sup>

An opportunity to reopen the Moroccan question came almost simultaneously with the collapse of the Kaiser's project for an alliance with Russia. At the end of 1904 a French mission was despatched to Fez with demands for reform. The French emissary apparently claimed that his government possessed a mandate from the Powers for the preservation of order in Morocco.<sup>45</sup> The Wilhelmstrasse was quick to take advantage of the coincidence of William II.'s acquiescence in a policy of active opposition to the plans of Delcassé and the first overt act of France since the conclusion of the Entente. The German agent at Fez was instructed to deny the man-

<sup>41</sup> Memoranda of Metternich, Dec. 18, Schulenburg, Dec. 18, and Eulenburg, Dec. 15; Bülow to William II., Dec. 26. *Ibid.*, XIX. 332-340, 360-367, 372, 373.

<sup>42</sup> Bülow to William II., Mar. 10, 1905, comment of latter. *Ibid.*, XX. 97, 98.

<sup>43</sup> Bülow to William II., Mar. 20 and 27, 1905. *Ibid.*, XX. 262, 263, 272.

<sup>44</sup> William II. to Bülow, Mar. 21(?), Bülow to William II., Mar. 20, Bülow to Tattenbach, Mar. 29, *ibid.*, XX. 263-265, 279, 280; Eckardstein, *Isolierung Deutschlands*, p. 100; Hammann, *Der Missverständne Bismarck* (Berlin, 1921), pp. 117, 118; *id.*, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Weltkrieges* (Berlin, 1918), p. 205; T. Wolff, *Das Vorspiel* (Munich, 1925), pp. 156-164.

<sup>45</sup> Despatches of Vassel, Feb. 22 and Mar. 7, G. P., XX. 255 n.; Tangier correspondence, London Times, Mar. 20.

datory claim and to use his influence to secure a refusal of the French reform programme.<sup>46</sup> The way was then paved for further action by elaborate expositions of German policy in the official press, in the Reichstag, and in despatches to foreign capitals. German territorial disinterestedness was asserted again and again. The failure of the Berlin government to intervene sooner was explained by the fact that German interests in Morocco were purely commercial, and these had not been disturbed prior to the sending of the French mission. Moreover, no official communication of the Anglo-French treaty had been made to Berlin.<sup>47</sup> By these more or less plausible arguments the real reason for the inactivity of Germany during 1904—the conflict between William II. and the Wilhelmstrasse—was concealed.

After the ground had been carefully prepared, dramatic assertion of the German claim to consideration in Morocco was given by the speech of William II. at Tangier. The Kaiser consented to this move reluctantly and only after great pressure from Bülow.<sup>48</sup> Once ashore, William II. played his part with a vigor which belied his lack of conviction; the determination of Germany to uphold the independence of Morocco was stated in terms which left no possibility of retreat.<sup>49</sup>

The impending crisis was awaited with equanimity by Bülow and Holstein. Their plan of action was already formulated, though it was announced piecemeal because public opinion was not yet convinced of the necessity for determined opposition to France.<sup>50</sup> Morocco, they argued, was an independent state; this fact had been confirmed by the Powers in the Treaty of Madrid (1880). Any attempt to infringe on the sovereignty of the Sultan was as much an international concern as the Straits question. France had disturbed the *status quo* by her reform programme and by claiming a mandate from the Powers. The French official press had advocated a protectorate over Morocco. A situation had therefore been created which called for international adjudication; France must answer for her conduct at a conference of the Powers.<sup>51</sup> This position was thought

<sup>46</sup> Bülow to Kühlmann, Jan. 30, Feb. 11, and Mar. 10. *G. P.*, XX. 247, 251–253, 260, 261.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. *North German Gazette*, Mar. 20, 22, and 26; *Vossische Zeitung*, Mar. 20. Bülow to Sternburg, Feb. 25, Bülow to Radolin, Mar. 22, *G. P.*, XX. 256–258, 267, 268. Cf. speech of Bülow in Reichstag, Mar. 29, *Reden*, II. 208–218.

<sup>48</sup> Schoen to For. Off., Mar. 31, *G. P.*, XX. 285; Eckardstein, *Isolierung*, p. 100; Hammann, *Missverständnisse Bismarck*, pp. 117, 118; *Vorgeschichte*, p. 205.

<sup>49</sup> Schoen to For. Off., Mar. 31. *G. P.*, XX. 286, 287.

<sup>50</sup> Mem. of Hammann, Apr. 3 and Apr. 7, with comments by Bülow. *Ibid.*, XX. 300, 301, 311–313.

<sup>51</sup> Bülow to Metternich, Mar. 22; mem. of Holstein, Apr. 3; Bülow to Monts, Apr. 11. *Ibid.*, XX. 268, 269, 297–299, 318–320.

irrefutable in Berlin, and apart from the question of its legality the international situation seemed to render impossible a refusal of the German demands. Roosevelt had signified his interest in the preservation of the "Open Door" in Morocco. English commercial circles resented the surrender of a profitable market to France, and the weak British government would be further hampered by fear of the United States. Spain and Italy could be won by an appeal to their jealousy of French expansion. Russia owed a debt of loyalty to Germany for services rendered in the Far Eastern war. France herself was distracted by the struggle with the Church, and the French government would be reluctant to precipitate a crisis out of which another "man on horseback" might emerge. "Under the circumstances", concluded Bülow, after analyzing for William II. the factors favoring the German position, "Your Majesty may await the outcome of the Moroccan question with a quiet mind."<sup>52</sup>

The events of the months following the Kaiser's landing at Tangier seemed to justify the confidence of the Wilhelmstrasse. The French government abandoned its attitude of confident reserve, and sought to effect an understanding with Berlin. Radolin, the German ambassador to France, was immediately instructed to refuse all discussion of Morocco.<sup>53</sup> The tension in Paris rapidly became acute. The Italian ambassador remonstrated: "C'est une situation impossible. Vous [Radolin and Delcassé] ne pouvez pas continuer à vous regarder comme des chiens de fayence."<sup>54</sup> Radolin himself found the strain intolerable and advocated in vain a hearing for the French proposals.<sup>55</sup> The espousal of the French cause by the English press produced no alarm in Berlin; the British government would not dare defy Roosevelt, and the mass of the English people were thought to be opposed to war.<sup>56</sup> Even in France the possibility of aid from

<sup>52</sup> Bülow to Metternich, Mar. 23; Bülow to William II., Mar. 26; Bülow to Alvensleben, Mar. 27; Bülow to Kühlmann, Mar. 27 and Apr. 3, expressing confidence that Roosevelt would support the German position, Bülow to William II., Apr. 4; Monts to For. Off., Apr. 12. *Ibid.*, XX. 270, 273-278, 293, 294, 301-303, 324.

<sup>53</sup> Bülow to Radolin, Apr. 3 and 5, Radolin to For. Off., Apr. 14, effort of Delcassé to open conversations. Mem. of Mühlberg, Apr. 19; the French ambassador had sought to open negotiations, but had been rebuffed, Radolin to For. Off., Apr. 27; Bülow comments: if the French wish good relations with us, they must first abandon their efforts to isolate us by disrupting the Triple Alliance and by turning England against us. *Ibid.*, XX. 297, 305, 328-330, 332, 333, 344, 345.

<sup>54</sup> Radolin to For. Off., Apr. 9. *Ibid.*, XX. 316, 317.

<sup>55</sup> Radolin to Bülow, Apr. 14; instructions to Radolin, Apr. 18, ruling out direct conversations with France. *Ibid.*, XX. 330-332, 334 n.

<sup>56</sup> Bülow to Sternburg, Apr. 27; Tattenbach to For. Off., Apr. 25. *Ibid.*, XX. 341, 342-344. Throughout the early months of the crisis both Harris and Chirol expressed approval of the German policy to Tattenbach and Kühlmann.

across the Channel seemed to arouse no enthusiasm. Rouvier, the French premier, admitted his conviction that England was trying to push France into war for selfish ends.<sup>57</sup> At the end of April he began to weaken in his support of Delcassé, and proposed a general Franco-German *entente* on all questions, except, of course, Alsace-Lorraine.<sup>58</sup> This suggestion produced a temporary shift of emphasis in Berlin. The idea of an *entente* was not rejected; Holstein and Bülow merely intimated that no improvement of relations could be expected while Delcassé remained in office.<sup>59</sup> For a time Rouvier held back. "Je ne puis faire tomber M. Delcassé sur un froncement de sourcils de l'Allemagne", he exclaimed. "On me le reprocherait toujours—toujours."<sup>60</sup> The steady pressure continued, however, and on June 3 Rouvier yielded. Three days later Delcassé was forced to resign.<sup>61</sup>

Both in France and in Germany the conviction was general that the elimination of the troublesome minister, together with Rouvier's assurance that there would be no disturbance of the *status quo* in Morocco, would end the crisis and make a rapprochement comparatively easy. Two of the most powerful French journals offered to join in the work of reconciliation, and William II. remarked to General Delacroix that he was overjoyed at the satisfactory solution of the Moroccan question.<sup>62</sup> This feeling of relief was short-lived. On the day before the fall of Delcassé, Bülow had effectively blocked any hope of a separate agreement by notifying the Moroccan Sultan of Germany's willingness to attend a conference of the Powers.<sup>63</sup> When Rouvier returned to his idea of an *entente* he was told that the policy of Delcassé had forced Germany to take a stand which could not be abandoned. "We can not leave the Sultan in the lurch",

<sup>57</sup> Radolin to Bülow, May 8. *G. P.*, XX. 373, 374. The arguments with which the Wilhelmstrasse reassured itself with regard to both France and England are admirably presented by Bernstorff, in a letter to Bülow, Apr. 22. *Ibid.*, XX. 609-615.

<sup>58</sup> Radolin to Bülow, Apr. 30 and May 1, *ibid.*, XX. 360, 361, 355-357. Eckardstein, *Isolierung*, pp. 102-115.

<sup>59</sup> Mem. of Holstein, May 2, had told Betzöld that Franco-German relations could not improve while Delcassé remained in office. Radolin to For. Off., May 13; Bülow to Radolin, May 30. *G. P.*, XX. 357-359, 376, 377, 388-390. Both William II. and Bülow felt that so long as Delcassé remained in office no improvement, but rather, increasing tension, was to be looked for in Franco-German relations. Eckardstein, *Isolierung*, p. 128.

<sup>60</sup> Radolin to Bülow, May 22; mem. of Miquel, May 31. *G. P.*, XX. 384, 385, 397-399.

<sup>61</sup> Radolin to For. Off., June 3. *Ibid.*, XX. 402, 403.

<sup>62</sup> Flotow to Bülow (two despatches), June 7, Bülow to Radolin, June 10. *Ibid.*, XX. 623-625, 429, 430; Eckardstein, *Isolierung*, pp. 139, 140.

<sup>63</sup> Bülow to Tattenbach, June 5. *G. P.*, XX. 413.

explained Bülow, "after he has issued the call for a conference at our suggestion."<sup>64</sup>

This high ethical ground served very well to convince the Kaiser, and, to a certain extent, German public opinion, of the necessity for holding fast to the demand for a conference, but it does not adequately account for the position of the Wilhelmstrasse. Neither does anxiety about the fate of Morocco explain the situation, although Bülow expected to secure for Germany at the projected conference the right to police Casablanca and other ports.<sup>65</sup> In the discussions following the fall of Delcassé it became increasingly apparent that Morocco was not in itself the point at issue. Morocco occupied "an infinitely small place" in German policy, Bülow wrote in July, 1905.<sup>66</sup> Any reforms the conference might make must inevitably fail, then France could advance, after reaching an understanding with Germany. The Wilhelmstrasse would be very generous, after the conference. Then Germany would not object even if France should wrest Tangier from Spain.<sup>67</sup> These were tempting suggestions, made at a time when Rouvier was willing to make great concessions to Germany. Why, then, a conference? Because, according to Bülow and Holstein, Delcassé was gone, but "Delcassé-ism" remained, and France must be shown the futility of opposition to Germany.<sup>68</sup> The idea was Holstein's, and is implicit in all his comments on the Entente. In February, 1906, he wrote: "The drift of France towards England began immediately after Fashoda, when the French saw that they could achieve nothing *against* England. Similarly, the French will begin to consider a rapprochement with us when they realize that the friendship of England . . . is not sufficient to secure German consent to the acquisition of Morocco by France, but that Germany must also be conciliated."<sup>69</sup> The Moroccan crisis was for him a decisive struggle for supremacy, in which war would be preferable to defeat. "A surrender would rank with Olmütz, and cause Fashoda to be forgotten."<sup>70</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Bülow to Flotow, June 6. *Ibid.*, XX. 404, 405.

<sup>65</sup> Bülow to Tattenbach, Apr. 30, June 19, July 11; Holstein to Radolin, July 2; Mühlberg to Tattenbach, Aug. 6. *Ibid.*, XX. 352, 448-451, 502-503, 524-526, 538-540.

<sup>66</sup> Mem. of Bülow (an unsigned and undated copy in French), July 1 (*circa*). *Ibid.*, XX. 497, 498.

<sup>67</sup> Holstein to Radolin, July 2. *Ibid.*, XX. 502, 503.

<sup>68</sup> Bülow to Radolin, June 10; Bülow to William II, June 2; mem. of Bülow, June 23, conversation with French ambassador. *Ibid.*, XX. 429, 430, 455-457, 459-461.

<sup>69</sup> Mem. of Holstein, Feb. 22, 1906. *Ibid.*, XXI. 206-208.

<sup>70</sup> Mem. of Holstein, Apr. 4, 1905. *Ibid.*, XX. 304, 305.



William II. never realized the implications of Holstein's policy. The Kaiser had consented reluctantly to the Tangier visit as a means of striking at Delcassé. Once the French Foreign Secretary had fallen, he thought the crisis was over, and after that it required all of Bülow's persuasive powers to keep him in line with the policy of the Wilhelmstrasse.<sup>71</sup> The Chancellor himself was no slavish supporter of his subordinate's views. At the beginning of the Moroccan crisis, in 1905, he opposed Holstein's desire to take an adamant stand for a conference. On the eve of Delcassé's fall he toyed for a moment with Rouvier's proposal for a Franco-German *entente*.<sup>72</sup> In the fall of 1905 he began to draw away from his subordinate's plans, and finally, during the Algeciras Conference, he emancipated himself completely.

From January to June, 1905, the Moroccan programme of Germany had worked smoothly. The fall of Delcassé meant the removal of a powerful opponent. Equally gratifying was the mistrust of England shown by the French, the feeling that the English wished a war so that France might pull British chestnuts out of the fire. With the renewed demand for a conference, however, the situation began to change. Rouvier abandoned his conciliatory attitude and refused to yield until he received a statement of the programme proposed by Germany for the conference. As Bülow refused to make any commitments before France had accepted the Sultan's invitation, a deadlock seemed inevitable.<sup>73</sup> Rumors of an English offer of military aid to France flourished despite repeated denials. Lansdowne admitted that if Germany should "lightheartedly" precipitate a crisis, British public opinion would probably compel action in favor of France.<sup>74</sup> Holstein sought to minimize the importance of a military alliance between the Entente Powers by arguing that Germany could easily defeat France and hold French territory as a "hostage" until England gave way.<sup>75</sup> Bülow was less optimistic. He was worried by renewed suggestions of a direct

<sup>71</sup> Radolin to Bülow, comments of William II., June 11; Bülow to William II., June 22; Stumm to Bülow, Apr. 17, 1907; comment of William II. *G. P.*, 407-409, 455-457, XXII. 564-567.

<sup>72</sup> Mem. of Miquel, comments of Bülow, May 30. *Ibid.*, XX. 393-397.

<sup>73</sup> Bülow to Radolin, June 12, 1905. *Ibid.*, XX. 431-433.

<sup>74</sup> Bülow to Schlieffen, June 4, 1905, asking for an estimate of the probable military effectiveness of Russia in the event of an early war; Monts to Bülow, June 12; Metternich to For. Off., June 16, 27, 28, and July 22; William II. to Bülow, June 24. *Ibid.*, XIX. 422, XX. 435-438, 464, 630-637, 646-648.

<sup>75</sup> Eckardstein, *Isolierung*, pp. 150-151; Hammann, *Vorgeschichte*, pp. 210, 216, 217; *id.*, *Bilder*, p. 35; *id.*, *Missverständnis Bismarck*, p. 123. Bülow to William II., June 22, urging the Kaiser not to yield; William II. to Bülow, June 24. *G. P.*, XX. 455-457, 464.



understanding with France from William II., and by the refusal of Spain and Italy to accept the conference until France and England had declared themselves. After many experiments the Chancellor hit on an expedient which satisfied Rouvier and saved his own face: the French government was to withdraw its objections to the conference after receiving assurances from Radolin that legitimate French interests would not be prejudiced. On July 8 Rouvier accepted this formula.<sup>76</sup> Germany had scored a second diplomatic victory, but this time only at the cost of a severe crisis.

Bülow's plan was now complete; Delcassé was gone and the conference was assured. He no longer looked forward with enthusiasm, however, to the actual meeting of the assemblage which he had called into existence. The powers had not supported Germany's defense of the "Open Door" with the enthusiasm which he had anticipated, and he was reluctant to follow Holstein in a policy which might, it was clear, result in the complete isolation of Germany. He welcomed, therefore, the proposal of William II. that the idea of a combination of the Triple and Dual Alliances be revived at the meeting of Kaiser and Tsar at Björkö. The Chancellor feared that, with peace impending in the Far East, Russian troops would soon be present in force on the eastern frontier of Germany. Peace would also give Edward VII. an opportunity to effect an *entente* with Russia. Despite the protests of Holstein that Witte and Lamsdorff would turn the proposals to use against Germany, Bülow forwarded a treaty draft to William II.<sup>77</sup>

The dramatic conference of the two emperors at Björkö has often been described, but nowhere better than in the message which William II. sent to Bülow on July 25.<sup>78</sup> The Kaiser prepared the ground by a long tirade against the passion of Edward VII. for concluding "a little agreement" with everyone. The Tsar was easily persuaded that a Continental alliance was the only method of blocking the evil designs of England. At the proper moment the Kaiser produced the treaty.

He [Nicholas II.] read once, twice, thrice, the text which you have received. I prayed that God would guide the will of the young ruler. All was still as death, only the lapping of the water and the sun shining bright and warm in the cozy cabin. Directly before me, dazzlingly white,

<sup>76</sup> Bülow to Radolin, June 28; Radolin to For. Off., June 30 and July 8, containing the text of the Franco-German agreement. *Ibid.*, XX. 487, 488, 493, 494, 514, 515.

<sup>77</sup> Interview with Richthofen; Eckardstein, *Isolierung*, pp. 166, 167. Bülow to For. Off. (for Holstein), July 20, 22; Holstein to Bülow, July 21, 22. *G. P.*, XIX. 435-445.

<sup>78</sup> William II. to Bülow, July 25. *Ibid.*, XIX. 458-465.

rode the *Hohenzollern*, and high in the morning air fluttered the imperial standard. Just as I read the motto "Gott mit uns" on the black cross, the Czar's voice beside me said: "That is quite excellent; I quite agree." My heart beat so violently I could hear it; I pulled myself together and said casually: "Should you like to sign it? It would be a very nice souvenir of our entrevue." He glanced over the sheet again and said, "Yes, I will" . . . .

And so the morning of the twenty-fourth of July, 1905, at Björköe is a turning point in the history of Europe, thanks be to God.

The joy of William II. was shared in the Wilhelmstrasse. No doubts were entertained of the validity of the treaty.<sup>79</sup> Bülow immediately suggested the use of Morocco as a bait to draw France into the agreement. "Morocco could serve no better purpose for us, and this would be the best ending of our Moroccan campaign." The wishes of France were to be treated with more consideration.<sup>80</sup> As a consequence, the conference programme which Rouvier submitted on August 2 was accepted almost unchanged on September 28.<sup>81</sup> The last obstacle to a Franco-German understanding seemed now to be removed, and on October 6 Bülow reverted to Rouvier's earlier suggestion of an *entente*. "My dear Fatherland", exclaimed William II., "is at last free from the clutch of the Franco-Russian vice"; the plan of Edward VII. to isolate Germany was about to recoil on England.<sup>82</sup>

On October 7 this vision of security was violently dissipated by a telegram from Nicholas II. stating that the first efforts to bring France into the Björkö treaty had not been successful. Since it now conflicted with the Dual Alliance, he concluded, the agreement must remain inoperative until France could be won over. A few days later Eulenburg received a similar message from Witte.<sup>83</sup> This move aroused great alarm in Berlin. The thread must be carefully respun, wrote Bülow, as it was of vital importance that it should not break. In his reply to the Tsar the Kaiser maintained that the Björkö agreement could not possibly conflict with the Dual Alliance, "provided, of course, the latter is not aimed directly at my country.

<sup>79</sup> Holstein to Bülow, July 25. *G. P.*, XIX. 457, 458. The quarrel between Bülow and William II. over the interpolation of the expression "en Europe" into the treaty draft by the Kaiser, despite its importance, does not fall within the limits of this study.

<sup>80</sup> Bülow to For. Off., July 31. *Ibid.*, XX. 531, 532.

<sup>81</sup> Radolin to For. Off., Aug. 2, the terms of the Franco-German agreement, Sept. 28. *Ibid.*, XX. 532, 533, 592.

<sup>82</sup> William II. to Bülow, July 25; Bülow to For. Off., Sept. 30; Richthofen to Bülow, Oct. 6. *Ibid.*, XIX. 458-465, XX. 594, 595, XXV. 196, 197.

<sup>83</sup> Nicholas II. to William II., Oct. 7, 1905; Witte to Eulenburg, Oct. 8. *Ibid.*, XIX. 512, 513, 519, 520.

... What is signed, is signed! and God is our Testator!"<sup>84</sup> Nicholas II. remained obdurate, and even ventured to suggest that Germany should be more accommodating to France in the Moroccan discussions. The Kaiser was reduced to despair. "The coalition is complete! King Edward VII. has handled the thing perfectly."<sup>85</sup>

As the Tsar retreated, the independence of France grew apace. On October 18, Rouvier declined to discuss Bülow's proposal for a Franco-German understanding, and a month later he calmly suggested that Germany consent in advance to a joint Franco-Spanish mandate for Morocco. Such a measure, he felt, would make French public opinion feel more kindly towards Germany.<sup>86</sup> Despatches from Paris and London showed clearly that the French had recovered their self-confidence and no longer mistrusted England. On the western frontier of Germany, French troops were drilling day and night and fortifications were being put into condition for war.<sup>87</sup> Indiscretions in the press and the statements of Grey to Metternich indicated that, even if the British government had not actually promised aid to France, there could be no doubt concerning the stand England would take in case of war.<sup>88</sup> The attitude of Italy was equally alarming. San Giuliano admitted that his hands were tied with regard to the Moroccan question and that the commitments of Italy to France and the Triple Alliance were hard to reconcile. Threats produced no better result than the promise that Italy would try to avoid an open stand on the side of France.<sup>89</sup>

The defection of Russia and Italy, and the growing solidarity of the Entente caused the Wilhelmstrasse to contemplate the approach-

<sup>84</sup> William II. to Nicholas II., Oct. 12; Bülow to Eulenburg, Oct. 18. *Ibid.*, XIX. 513, 514, 520.

<sup>85</sup> Nicholas II. to William II., Nov. 23; William II. to Bülow, Nov. 26. *Ibid.*, XIX. 522-525.

<sup>86</sup> Radolin to For. Off., Oct. 18; Flotow to Bülow, Nov. 23. *Ibid.*, XX. 596, 597; XXI. 15-17.

<sup>87</sup> At the beginning of 1906 a war panic spread through France and Germany (Metternich to Bülow, Nov. 2, 1905, *ibid.*, XX. 672-678). Radolin reported to Bülow that the French expected an attack (Jan. 8, *ibid.*, XXI. 60, 61). The report of the Sixteenth Army Corps Headquarters to Moltke and that of Mutius provoked a near-ultimatum from Bülow (Jan. 6, *ibid.*, XXI. 71, 73, 74) which was, however, cancelled. Bülow to Radolin, Jan. 7, *ibid.*, 71, 72.

<sup>88</sup> Metternich to Bülow, Jan. 3 and 4, 1906, analysis of British position; Bülow to Metternich, Jan. 9, denies desire to smash the Entente or to raise the question of prestige, and affirms his desire to settle the question without victors or vanquished; *ibid.*, XXI. 45-52, 62, 63, 82-87. Grey to Lascelles and to Campbell-Bannerman, Jan. 9, 1906; Grey, *op. cit.*, I. 80-82, 114, 115.

<sup>89</sup> Monts to Bülow, Jan. 2; Bülow to Monts, Jan. 5, in which the hope of securing the police mandate for Italy is held out if Italy would support Germany; Monts to Bülow, Jan. 6. *G. P.*, XXI. 34-37, 53, 54, 56-58.

ing conference with gloomy foreboding. Bülow warned that isolation must be avoided at all costs. "If the majority, or all the powers oppose our stand on any point, arguments or threats will be worthless; in view of all that has gone before, our position will seem ridiculous." On the other hand, Germany could not give way beyond a certain point; better a break, he felt, than a diplomatic defeat such as a general mandate for the policing of Morocco for France.<sup>90</sup> Holstein admitted the possibility of war, but the prospect did not appal him as it did the Chancellor. Holstein was confident that France could easily be overcome; he even felt that the German fleet might prove strong enough to duplicate the Confederate naval exploits of the American Civil War.<sup>91</sup>

Almost immediately after the conference opened at Algeciras in January, 1906, Bülow's worst fears were realized. The French government asked that France and Spain be entrusted with the task of policing Morocco.<sup>92</sup> When Bülow pointed out, through Radolin, that Rouvier had promised not to ask for a general mandate, he was told that "all questions must be examined at Algeciras, since France, at the demand of Germany, had agreed to submit them to a conference".<sup>93</sup> The possibility of a direct understanding between Paris and Berlin was thus decisively ended; everything depended on the attitude of the other powers. As weeks passed, the isolation of Germany became increasingly apparent.<sup>94</sup> England and Russia were openly hostile, and even Roosevelt showed a growing sympathy for the French position. Austria was loyal, but counselled retreat.<sup>95</sup>

<sup>90</sup> Mem. of Bülow, Nov. 23; mem. of Mühlberg, Dec. 25, summing up views expressed by Bülow. *G. P.*, XXI. 14, 15, 28, 29. At the end of 1905 a proposal was made from unofficial French quarters that France and Germany dispose of Morocco by a secret agreement before the conference opened. The fact that the proposal was seriously considered, and was rejected largely from fear of placing Germany at the mercy of France, shows how far Bülow had retreated from his earlier position. Mem. of Mühlberg, Nov. 30 and Dec. 25, 1905. *Ibid.*, XXI. 20-22, 28, 29.

<sup>91</sup> Mem. of Holstein, Jan. 18, 1906. *Ibid.*, XXI. 96, 97.

<sup>92</sup> Bülow to Radowitz, Jan. 8, instructing him to inform his French colleague that a demand for a French police mandate would precipitate the collapse of the conference. *Ibid.*, XXI. 60.

<sup>93</sup> Radolin to For. Off., Feb. 15. *Ibid.*, XXI. 171, 172.

<sup>94</sup> The necessity of a retreat was being urged on all sides (Radowitz to For. Off., Feb. 5); a Franco-Spanish mandate would be as bad as one for France alone; either would result ultimately in the destruction of Moroccan independence. Bülow to Radowitz, Feb. 7. *Ibid.*, XXI. 140, 141, 143-146.

<sup>95</sup> Wedel to For. Off., Feb. 12; Schoen to For. Off., Feb. 19; Metternich to For. Off., Feb. 19; Sternburg to For. Off., Feb. 19; Schoen to For. Off., Feb. 23; mem. of Bülow, Feb. 24; Radowitz to For. Off., Feb. 26; Moltke to For. Off., Feb. 23. *Ibid.*, XXI. 157-159, 178-183, 211-214, 223, 224, 525, 526.

For a time the German government stood firm against all pressure. The Kaiser, Bülow, and Holstein reiterated their determination not to consent to a Franco-Spanish mandate.<sup>96</sup> By the beginning of March, however, the deadlock was complete, and Bülow, faced with the collapse of the conference and the possibility of war, ordered a retreat.<sup>97</sup> Holstein protested in vain; to him a diplomatic crisis, even war, was preferable to surrender to the Entente entailing, as he saw it, the end of the hegemony of Germany. Bülow refused to listen to the counsels of his bellicose adviser, and retreated from point to point, finally accepting substantially the terms for which France had been contending since January.<sup>98</sup>

On April 5, 1906, Bülow presented a defense of German policy at Algeciras to the Reichstag in a speech completely devoid of his usual wit and energy.<sup>99</sup> When he ended the storm broke. Violent denunciations of the diplomacy of the Wilhelmstrasse were made from both sides of the house. In the midst of a savage attack by Bebel, the Chancellor suddenly collapsed in his seat. A few hours later Tschirschky, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, presented to William II. the resignation Holstein had written in anger after Bülow had ordered the retreat at Algeciras. The Kaiser signed the

<sup>96</sup> Holstein to Radolin, Feb. 10: better the collapse of the conference than surrender; Bülow to Monts, Feb. 13 (also sent to Vienna, Washington, and London): if further concessions are demanded Germany might prefer to wreck the conference as the lesser evil; Metternich to For. Off., Feb. 20, comments of William II. proclaim determination not to yield; mem. of Bülow, Feb. 23, draft of a reply to Witte stating that William II. would prefer that the conference should collapse rather than surrender to the French; Schoen to For. Off., Feb. 23; comment of Bülow, accept "die bisherigen französischen Vorschläge—nein!!" *Ibid.*, XXI. 152-154, 159, 160, 188, 197, 198, 211-213.

<sup>97</sup> Radowitz to For. Off., Mar. 3, announcing isolation of Germany; Bülow comments "Wenig erfreulich!", Wedel to For. Off., Mar. 4; Holstein to Radolin, Mar. 4, appealing for a separate Franco-German settlement, apparently as a desperate effort to save the situation. *Ibid.*, XXI. 233, 234, 237-239. His action was practically repudiated by Bülow on the following day (Bülow to Radolin and comments on a despatch from Radolin, *ibid.*, XXI. 240-241). When his views were rejected Holstein presented his resignation and bombarded Bülow with protests (Hammann, *Vorgeschichte*, pp. 229-236; *id.*, *Bilder*, pp. 37, 38; *id.*, *Missverständnisse Bismarck*, pp. 134-136). An assertion sometimes met with in German writings is of interest. It is contended that Holstein was playing the Bourse and wished a crisis "to make a killing". This idea is seriously suggested in a letter recently received by the present writer from an official of the Foreign Office under the imperial régime.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. G. P., XXI. 239-331, for the successive steps in Bülow's retreat. Throughout, the importance of the attitude of Roosevelt is apparent. After Bülow's final surrender, the latter wrote that the maintenance of friendly relations between Germany and the United States was of more importance than the whole of Morocco. Bülow to Sternburg, Mar. 19. *Ibid.*, XXI. 309, 310.

<sup>99</sup> Bülow's *Reden*, II. 303-306.

document with relief; the strange career of the "Grey Eminence" of German diplomacy was ended.<sup>100</sup>

### III.

The defeat of Germany at Algeciras was complete; Bülow had accepted almost the identical terms which in December, 1905, he had precluded in advance as constituting a diplomatic triumph for France. In the Wilhelmstrasse, however, the smart of wounded pride was speedily forgotten under the pressure of new difficulties. The events of the conference had left Germany isolated. Reports from Paris stated that even "correct and normal" relations with France could be hoped for only through the exercise of great tact.<sup>101</sup> William II. was at last convinced that loyal friendship could never be expected from Russia.<sup>102</sup> In this "comparative isolation" Bülow felt that "our relations with Austria are more important than ever before". He appreciated the dangers of the situation; once Austria realized the dependence of Germany, the Dual Monarchy would develop an assertiveness which might embroil her ally in problems outside the German field of interest. Bülow thought it essential, therefore, to maintain the alliance with Italy, even though he was aware of the emptiness of Italian promises.<sup>103</sup> William II. was virulent in his denunciation of the third member of the Triple Alliance. "The Bible says that no man can serve two masters; certainly not three masters! France, England, and the Triple Alliance—that is impossible! . . . We not only have no friends, but the Latins hate us. . . . A struggle between Teutons and Latins along the whole line! And unfortunately the former are divided!"<sup>104</sup>

The only solution of this *impasse* seemed an effort to reunite the "Teutons". Grey had earlier expressed a desire to adjust Anglo-German relations once the Moroccan question was settled; Metternich was now instructed to remind him of this statement.<sup>105</sup> The ambassador was reluctant to risk a rebuff: "Let sleeping dogs lie", he advised. The Berlin government insisted, however, and proposed

<sup>100</sup> Hammann, *Vorgeschichte*, pp. 233-236; *id.*, *Bilder*, p. 38.

<sup>101</sup> Flotow to Bülow, Apr. 23, 1906. *G. P.*, XXI. 348-350.

<sup>102</sup> Schoen to Bülow, Mar. 25, 1906, with picturesque comments by William II.; Wedel to Bülow, Apr. 30, comments of William II. *Ibid.*, XXI. 316-320, XXV. 10, 11.

<sup>103</sup> Bülow to William II., May 31. *Ibid.*, XXI. 360-362.

<sup>104</sup> Monts to Bülow, Mar. 8, and Stumm to Bülow, Mar. 9, both with comments of William II. *Ibid.*, XXI. 353, 267, 268.

<sup>105</sup> Metternich to Bülow, Nov. 2, 1905, and Jan. 3, 1906, for Grey's desire to better Anglo-German relations; Tschirschky to Metternich, May 1, 1906. *Ibid.*, XX. 672-678, XXI. 45-51, 423, 424.

the Bagdad Railway as the first question to be adjusted.<sup>106</sup> For a time the negotiations proceeded without difficulty, but in June, 1906, the French began to show uneasiness at the incipient *détente*. The Wilhelmstrasse hastened to give assurances in Paris that the negotiations were merely designed to "exercise a favorable influence on world peace", but this statement was received with open scepticism by the French. The reaction in England was immediate; in official circles and in the press the friendly attitude towards Germany gave way to icy reserve.<sup>107</sup>

For a time the German government continued its efforts to promote an understanding. An army order affecting reserve officers in America was blocked by Tschirschky on the ground that it might be misunderstood in England and thus interfere with the "very earnest desire" of the Wilhelmstrasse "to produce a gradual improvement in the situation".<sup>108</sup> At his meeting with Edward VII. in August, the Kaiser suggested that England and Germany agree in advance on a common programme for the Hague Conference. "It is a matter of secondary importance whether anything concrete results", he explained; the agreement would merely be an evidence of friendly feeling. Edward VII. promised to recommend the project to his government, but turned aside all discussion of an *entente* with Germany: "there are no frictions between us", he explained, "there exists only rivalry."<sup>109</sup> Grey's attitude was equally non-committal. Metternich tried desperately to convince the Foreign Secretary that "a really peaceful policy would be to extend a hand to Germany and draw her into the circle" instead of creating a ring of hostile states around the Central Powers. As Grey continued evasive, Metternich asked bluntly: "Are openly avowed friendly relations with Germany compatible with England's friendship with France?" "That depends on German politics", replied Grey. "No", retorted Metternich, "it rather seems to depend on French interpretation of German politics."<sup>110</sup>

As months passed without tangible result, Metternich grew discouraged. In September he strongly advised against further efforts to propitiate England. The British know Germany wants their friendship, he argued, and continual harping on the subject will be

<sup>106</sup> Metternich to Bülow, May 4; Tschirschky to Stumm, May 24. *Ibid.*, XXI. 424-427, XXV. 203.

<sup>107</sup> Mühlberg to Radolin, June 27; Metternich to Bülow, June 27; Tschirschky to Metternich, July 7. *Ibid.*, XXI. 437, 438, XXV. 216, 217, XXI. 438-439. Grey to Bertie, July 9; Grey, *op. cit.*, I. 110-112.

<sup>108</sup> Tschirschky to Einem, July 9. *G. P.*, XXI. 440, 441.

<sup>109</sup> Mem. of William II., Aug. 15. *Ibid.*, XXI. 453-455, XXIII. 84-86.

<sup>110</sup> Metternich to Bülow, July 31. *Ibid.*, XXI. 441-448.



taken as a sign of weakness. The Wilhelmstrasse was reluctantly forced to admit the wisdom of this point of view.<sup>111</sup> All other avenues of escape from isolation seemed closed. For a time the possibility of a renewal of the *Dreikaiserbund* was discussed, but the idea was rejected through fear of another rebuff from Russia.<sup>112</sup> France was more hostile than at any time since the Boulanger crisis; rumors of a military alliance between the members of the Entente flourished in Paris, and the French people showed an enthusiasm for things military which had been lacking for many years.<sup>113</sup> The efforts of the British government to bring Russia into the Entente were watched with anxiety in Berlin now that it was evident that Germany could not hope for a similar agreement with England.<sup>114</sup> "A nice outlook!" exclaimed William II. "We must bargain in the future with the Franco-Russian Alliance, the Anglo-French Entente, and an Anglo-Russian Entente, with Spain, Italy, and Portugal as secondary satellites."<sup>115</sup>

One arises from the study of almost any part of German diplomatic history after 1890 with a feeling of profound pessimism. Were Bülow, Holstein, William II. fighting against "the army of unalterable law"? Is it true that the causes for the downfall of the German Empire are to be found "not only back of the change of government in 1890, but back of the Empire's foundation"?<sup>116</sup> Or might one better say that Bismarck's heritage had fallen to a generation of little men? On these larger questions it is impossible to speak with confidence. With regard to the point of view of the participants themselves, however, it is possible to formulate at least tentative conclusions. At the end of 1903 the rulers of Germany found themselves confronted with a diplomatic revolution of momentous proportions, a revolution which seemed to endanger not only the hegemony, but even the safety of Germany. Englishmen might regard the new situation as an escape from German domination; for Germans the "encirclement" meant political vassalage to powers whose motives were at best no less egotistical than those of the Wilhelmstrasse. This revolution came when the control of German

<sup>111</sup> Metternich to Tschirschky, Sept. 15; Metternich to Bülow, Oct. 17; the comment of William II. is significant: "The attitude of England will never change until we are strong enough on the sea to be valuable allies." *G. P.*, XXI. 461-464.

<sup>112</sup> Bülow to Schoen, Aug. 1; mem. of Bülow, Nov. 16. *Ibid.*, XXII. 30, 31, XXI. 384-386.

<sup>113</sup> Flotow to Bülow, Sept. 9; Flotow to Pourtalès, Sept. 19; Flotow to Bülow, Oct. 18; Radolin to Bülow, Nov. 4. *Ibid.*, XXI. 527-530, 543-546, 530, 531.

<sup>114</sup> Miquel to Bülow, Sept. 1. *Ibid.*, XXII. 32-34.

<sup>115</sup> *Id.* to *id.*, Sept. 19, comment of William II. *Ibid.*, XXV. 23.

<sup>116</sup> J. V. Fuller, *Bismarck's Diplomacy at its Zenith* (Cambridge, 1922), p. 324.

foreign policy was divided, with no single will dominating. Under the stress of the times one expedient after another was tried. All failed. The rulers of Germany attributed their defeat to the evil machinations of rival statesmen. Englishmen and Frenchmen thought their own success meant the thwarting of an overweening ambition. A third point of view is possible. In 1891 Lord Salisbury sagely remarked that if nations act together in great crises, they do so not because of "signatures upon a piece of paper", but because of common interests.<sup>117</sup> By 1904 German interests, in the Near East, in China, in Alsace-Lorraine, in naval and colonial problems, cut squarely across those of other states. Under the circumstances opposition was inevitable, and friends could be won only by the sacrifice of some part of the German programme. From this point of view, the bellicose Holstein showed greater wisdom than his more pacific superiors when he contended that Germany must either retreat or risk the danger of war.

RAYMOND J. SONTAG.

<sup>117</sup> Mansion House Speech. *London Times* (weekly edition), July 31, 1891.

## THE AGRICULTURAL REFORMERS OF THE ANTE-BELLUM SOUTH<sup>1</sup>

THE problems which the agricultural reformers of the ante-bellum South faced were the same fundamental problems which their kind have faced in all times and in all places. Stated in simplest form their task was one of introducing methods among those who tended the soil which would give profits without destroying fertility and which, in regions where already the earth's fullness had been spent, would restore lands to fruitfulness. The Old South faced the problems of profits and restoration; the Lower South, the problems of profits and conservation. The difference was merely one of age—the tobacco lands of the one were already badly depleted, the cotton and sugar lands of the other were everywhere being reduced by wasteful practices.<sup>2</sup>

And yet there was nothing unique about the Southern situation and the forces that had produced it, nor is there any vital reason why the problems of the Old South and the Lower South should be separated for treatment from those of the North and the Northwest. All sections alike were confronted by the ruins which the destructive methods of frontier days had wrought, and which they were still leaving in their wake as the pioneer passed through the forest and over the farming lands.<sup>3</sup> If the Old South had greater ruins than did the other sections, it was largely because it had been more successful in quickly and cheaply gathering the riches which Nature offered and in spending them in the far-away markets where the comforts and luxuries of a more advanced life might be secured. Thus, while the settlers of Massachusetts yielded their English standards of living under the scanty returns of a stingy Nature, the Old South, with its destructive tobacco culture, went on to the reproduction of an English gentry order which seemed to give adequate compensation for the ruined soils. And if the Lower South in the ante-bellum

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the meeting of the American Historical Association, at Rochester, Dec. 28, 1926. The Kentucky-Tennessee region and Texas have not been included in this study. Both had their reform leaders and deserve separate study.

<sup>2</sup> See A. O. Craven, *Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Virginia and Maryland, 1606-1860* (Urbana, Ill., 1925).

<sup>3</sup> It should be noticed that the so-called "soil exhaustion" was but the agricultural side of frontier exploitation of natural resources, which was matched in the treatment accorded the forest, mineral resources, etc.

period was in like manner exploiting its soils in extensive, single-crop, cotton production, it was doing no more than the frontier farmer of the Northwest was attempting to do with his wheat and corn with results that differed largely according to the hunger of the markets found for the crops produced. The frontier everywhere created problems of restoration and varied the degree of ruin which it left only by the speed with which it gave way to a more complex and diversified economic-social order.<sup>4</sup>

Other factors, however, had a hand in creating Southern agricultural problems. In the colonial period, tobacco not only bore the burden of quickly lifting a frontier to a complex life, but it long carried the added load of British regulations and taxation and that of an indirect and expensive marketing system.<sup>5</sup> In the ante-bellum period the frontier cotton planter of the Lower South likewise struggled against the action of government in the form of tariffs, which many students of the South still believe to have been harmful, and sold his crops in distant markets through the hands of Northern factors that were as greedy as their predecessors of Scottish and English origin. Under such conditions the planters of both periods were forced to centre their efforts upon the most profitable single crop, produced by those methods most economical of capital and labor, but which could draw most heavily upon the virgin soils as the planter's one advantage in production. If profits were to be made which were capable of maintaining the social standards established, then soil-conserving agriculture was out of the question.

Nor were these factors peculiarly Southern or limited to this time and place. Agriculture as a more primitive economic effort seldom gains the political favors freely given to the industrial interests which represent the rise of a more complex social-economic order. Manufacturing means the development of an advanced stage of progress, and it inevitably secures favors in any society rising from primitive foundations. It has usually been considered decidedly "American" to give aid to industry; it has as often been considered "un-American" to even suggest aid by legislation for agriculture. Furthermore, the scattered character of rural society and the peculiar individualism developed by a life lived apart in constant contact with a wilful Nature places the marketing of the farmer's crops in the hands of

<sup>4</sup> B. H. Hibbard, *The History of Agriculture in Dane County, Wisconsin*, pp. 125-131; J. G. Thompson, *The Rise and Decline of the Wheat Growing Industry in Wisconsin*, pp. 20-23; J. F. W. Johnston, *Notes on North America*, I. 163, 172, 355; *Genesee Farmer*, VI. 108; R. H. Holt, "History of Wheat Growing in Illinois, 1840-1870" (master's thesis, University of Illinois, 1926, MS.).

<sup>5</sup> A. O. Craven, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-50.

middlemen who need seldom fear any sustained combination or co-operation in resistance to prices paid for produce. The farmer usually gains from the sale of his crops just enough to keep him going at his task and plunders his soils for any additional returns. It is probably a fact that little wealth has ever been acquired from American agriculture except that which has come from exploiting the natural fertility of the soil and from the so-called "unearned increment" which has arisen from the constantly increasing values of land. And there is no reason to hope, unless decided changes come, that, with the ending of these two sources of profit, the American farmer will not follow the course of farmers in all lands, in all periods of time, and accept the status of a peasant as his lot.<sup>6</sup>

Only one factor belongs to the South as a unique force in the creation of ante-bellum problems. That arose from the peculiar character of her geographic and climatic conditions. Southern rainfall was always heavy and concentrated. The annual precipitation ranged from forty to eighty inches, and showers yielding as much as fifteen inches of water in the course of three days were known to have fallen. Such rainfall, even under the most favorable conditions, would present serious problems, but in the South where the sod-formation was always poor, many of the soils loose or their sub-soils compact, and much of the land rolling or even badly broken, the losses from leaching and erosion were always serious.<sup>7</sup> Added to this, the warm climate caused the soils to teem with life, and soil diseases and harmful micro-organisms were given a wider play than in any other part of the country.<sup>8</sup> In these features the problems of the South were in degree greater and the losses permitted by poor methods more extensive than elsewhere. But in all else little can be found that belonged distinctly to this section. In the main the problems presented were the normal and universal problems of the American farmer.

<sup>6</sup> Prices, of course, are not fixed by the local middleman. The term is used here to indicate the whole indirect process by which the farmer's crops are handled and to indicate the failure of the farmer, either by control of production or by organization in selling, to have a hand in determining the selling price of his produce.

The statement regarding the failure of agriculture to produce wealth is based upon a comparison of the wealth in certain typical regions with the increased values of land and the rather uncertain matter of soil deterioration. The problem is highly involved and definite conclusions impossible. The statement made here, however, seems to the writer to be warranted by his studies.

<sup>7</sup> W. W. Ashe, *Review of Reviews*, XXXIX. 439-443; R. O. E. Davis, "Soil Erosion in the South", *Bulletin United States Department of Agriculture*; Bennett, *The Soils and Agriculture of the South*.

<sup>8</sup> E. J. Russell, *Soil Conditions and Plant Growth*, pp. 150-151.

Reduced to practical terms, the reformers of the South had first to arouse a will to improve and then to indicate the steps by which profitable changes might be made; the old monoculture had to come to an end and a wider diversification of crops be adopted; the widest use of fertilizers, both natural and artificial, was imperative; better plowing, which would not only reach new soil but also check the losses from erosion, had to be introduced; and everywhere, both on low and on higher lands, better drainage systems developed. If these improvements could be made and profits still maintained, then the South might go on to power and prosperity.

The first great reformer of the period was John Taylor of Caroline. Writing to Thomas Jefferson in an early day, he declared: "There is a spice of fanaticism in my nature upon two subjects—agriculture and republicanism, which all who set it in motion, are sure to suffer by."<sup>9</sup> Fortunately for Virginia and the entire South there was much to keep in motion the "fanaticism" of this keen intellect, and through his efforts the whole region was awakened to a realization of serious dangers which threatened, and started upon the road toward reform. His agricultural work perhaps reached its fullest expression in the publication of his book, *Arator*, which brought together the ideas he had stated earlier in private correspondence, in public addresses, or even in scattered newspaper articles. It made its appearance in 1813, and, as Edmund Ruffin later said, "opened the eyes of many in this part of the country to see that agriculture ought to be and did embrace more than simply cutting down trees, grubbing and plowing land".<sup>10</sup> "It was . . . throughout a trumpet-tongued exposure" of the "general impoverishment and ruinous progress" which everywhere held sway.<sup>11</sup>

John Taylor saw clearly the great agricultural problem of the Old South. "Our land has diminished in fertility", he declared as he pointed to whole counties where once tobacco grew in great quantities but which were now "too sterile to grow any of moment", or to keep the wheat crops, which had been substituted, up to the level of profits.<sup>12</sup> "No profit . . . can be made by tilling poor land", he said, ". . . to make it rich, therefore, ought to be the first object of our efforts."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup> John Taylor to Thomas Jefferson, Mar. 5, 1795, Papers of Thomas Jefferson (Library of Congress). For sketch of John Taylor, see W. E. Dodd, "John Taylor of Caroline, Prophet of Secession", *John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph-Macon College*, II. (June, 1908) 214-353.

<sup>10</sup> *Farmer's Register*, II. 12-14.

<sup>11</sup> *Southern Planter*, XII. 258.

<sup>12</sup> John Taylor, *Arator*, pp. 11-12, 14.

<sup>13</sup> John Taylor to Thomas Jefferson, Mar. 5, 1795, Jefferson MSS.; *Arator*, pp. 68-71.

The only practical way to a restored fertility, as Taylor saw it, lay in the creation and use of all kinds of manure—animal and vegetable.<sup>14</sup> The atmosphere was the great source of life, and plants alone could draw upon it and reduce its creative substances to a form in which they could be given to the earth, either directly by plowing under the plants themselves or indirectly by the application of animal manure. Plants, like animals, feed upon each other, he thought, and organic material alone could return the capital so lavishly spent by the harvests of earlier days. The first step, therefore, from which Taylor advanced to all others was summed up in what he called “enclosing”.<sup>15</sup> This was his way of practising his doctrine that “the best system of practical agriculture” was the one offering “the best mode of raising manure”.<sup>16</sup> By it he meant the exclusion of all stock from the arable and grass lands and the production of those crops which afforded the greatest amount of offal for conversion into manure by plowing under, penning, bedding, or feeding.

The one crop which seemed to him to give greatest advantage both for profit and improvement was the then despised Indian corn. Corn furnished a maximum of food for both man and beast and its generous stocks, blades, shucks, and cobs could be used for barnyard litter or could be plowed under in the fields as direct vegetable manure. “We seek after a vegetable proper for poor ground”, he writes, “it is found in corn.”<sup>17</sup>

But corn as a single crop was not to be tolerated. Clover was to be grown on every spot where it could be “prevailed upon to exist”, and field peas together with every kind of grass were commended for widest use in improving rotation.<sup>18</sup> Deep and horizontal plowing to check erosion was to accompany these crops, and artificial fertilizers, such as gypsum, lime, and marl, were heartily approved. In fact there was scarcely a thing along the line of advancement, from the use of better machinery to the selection of better seed, that escaped his eager eye or was left out of his constructive programme.<sup>19</sup>

But Taylor was as keen a critic as he was a builder, and his sharp attack upon the ills and enemies of agriculture was as telling as were his suggestions for reform. Tobacco was rejected; the overseer system was condemned; the drawing of capital and ability from agri-

<sup>14</sup> *Niles' Weekly Register*, XV. 177-181.

<sup>15</sup> *Arator*, pp. 72-86; *Farmer's Register*, VII. 561-564.

<sup>16</sup> *Arator*, p. 87.

<sup>17</sup> John Taylor to Thomas Jefferson, Mar. 5, 1795, Jefferson MSS.

<sup>18</sup> *Richmond Enquirer*, June 16, 1818; *Memoirs of the Philadelphia Agricultural Society*, II. 100; *American Farmer*, I. 257 ff.

<sup>19</sup> *Arator*, pp. 150-152, 111-113; *American Farmer*, II. 31; Taylor to Jefferson, Nov. 19, 1797, Jefferson MSS.



culture to industry was bitterly noted; the folly of too many slaves for personal supervision was pointed out; and the neglect of agriculture by the government as contrasted to the tariffs given to manufacturing was denounced as a burden thrust upon the one for the benefit of the other.<sup>20</sup> In fact, it is a question whether Taylor's greatest contribution lies in improvements preached or in attacks launched against the shortcomings of the old order. Viewed from either angle—as a force in awakening men to the realization of a bad situation or as a leader in new things—John Taylor of Caroline must be placed at the head of the list of early ante-bellum agricultural reformers.

A few other men of the earlier period deserve some attention. James M. Garnett of Fredericksburg in Virginia was early urging reform through the medium of the Agricultural Society and the public press.<sup>21</sup> He advocated the selection of seed corn from the larger and more prolific stocks; he condemned the extravagances in living which consumed the capital so necessary for improvements; he urged men to adopt better methods of plowing and took his stand alongside of John Taylor in uncompromising opposition to protective tariffs; he worked unceasingly for the organization and extension of the agricultural society, local, state, and national, and no voice was lifted more untiringly in the effort to arouse men to the realization of their shortcomings or in pointing out the ways for improvement.

Thomas Mann Randolph should be noticed for his work with horizontal plowing;<sup>22</sup> Stephen McCormick for his improved plows;<sup>23</sup> Fielding Lewis for the early use of lime on soils;<sup>24</sup> Philip Tabb, John Singleton, William Meriwether, and W. C. Nicholas for the extensive use of manure, deep plowing, and grass crops in improving rotations.<sup>25</sup> Nor can the work of George Jefferys of North Carolina be passed by. He corresponded with improving farmers all over the Old South, sent out questionnaires dealing with the subjects of ferti-

<sup>20</sup> *Arator*, pp. 41-52, 232, 260.

<sup>21</sup> *American Farmer*, II. 89, III. 114, IV. 41, 290-291; *Farmer's Register*, IV. 541-544; *Richmond Enquirer*, Nov. 3, 1818, Aug. 20, 24, 27, 1819.

<sup>22</sup> American Historical Association, *Annual Report* for 1918, I. 299-300; *American Farmer*, II. 94-95.

<sup>23</sup> *Richmond Enquirer*, Jan. 5, 1826; Stephen McCormick Papers (Mr. Herbert Kellar of the McCormick Library, Chicago, kindly placed at my disposal papers showing the importance of McCormick's plows to this section); *American Farmer*, IV. 189; *Richmond Enquirer*, Aug. 13, 1819.

<sup>24</sup> *Southern Planter*, XIV. 19-20; *Farmer's Register*, I. 18.

<sup>25</sup> *American Farmer*, II. 28, 115; *Richmond Enquirer*, Oct. 27, 1818, June 8, 1819, Aug. 13, 1819, June 9, 1820; *Farmer's Register*, X. 94; *Southern Planter*, LXXV. 757. (These references typical of many that might be given to show the work of these men.)

lizers, plowing, and crop rotation, and then by letter and printed article scattered the knowledge gained to every corner of the section.<sup>26</sup> To these men credit is due for their teachings, but there were many others who practised but did not preach because, as one of them said: "I have been too negligent in my profession, and have ploughed the old farm up and down hill so long, that its soil has followed the plough furrows, branches, and creeks, until it has in all probability reached the Atlantic, leaving me in my fifty-second year, to renovate the sub-soil . . . instead of writing in my parlour for your periodical. . . ." <sup>27</sup>

Little of permanent success came to these early reformers, but the fault was not their own. Markets and ways to market were poor, and improved farming requires profits in order to succeed. The whole law and gospel of agricultural improvement, for all times, is expressed in the words of the Virginia farmer who wrote in 1821: "It is not worth while to make crops, we can get nothing for them. . . . Neither is it any object to improve lands. . . ."

The second group of agricultural reformers, whose efforts run well down to the War between the States, may well be headed by the energetic John Skinner of Baltimore.<sup>28</sup> Trained for the law and admitted to the bar, he early turned aside to accept Madison's appointment as postmaster at Baltimore, in which position he found time in 1819 to begin the publication of the *American Farmer*. It was the *Farmer's* "great aim and chief pride to collect information from every source, on every branch of Husbandry", in order that the readers by comparisons might discover "the best system" for "all circumstances".<sup>29</sup> Almost from its first issue it became the organ through which individual reformers conveyed their ideas to the public, and in which the agricultural societies ordered their papers and proceedings published. From its office the first guano used in the South was distributed;<sup>30</sup> in its pages the editor described improved methods observed in his travels; its editorial columns urged reform and advocated the establishment of agricultural schools, the employment of agricultural chemists, and the wider organization of farmers for co-operation and exchange of ideas. From 1819 throughout the

<sup>26</sup> *American Farmer*, II. 5, 14, 28, 59, 374, etc.

<sup>27</sup> *Farmer's Register*, IV. 577-579. Other names, such as John Wickham, Thomas Marshall, F. Tilghman, and J. H. Roy, might be added, but the purpose here has been only to list the outstanding leaders.

<sup>28</sup> For a sketch of John Skinner's life, see *American Farmer*, fourth series, VII. 325.

<sup>29</sup> *American Farmer*, I. 5.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, VI. 316.

period, under different editors and even under different names, it continued to preach the gospel of reform.<sup>31</sup>

Skinner himself left the *American Farmer* in the late 'twenties, edited *The Turf Register* for a time, acted as assistant postmaster general under Harrison, then returned to agricultural work as editor of the *Farmer's Library and Agricultural Journal* in New York City and later of *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil* in Philadelphia. The name of John Skinner became associated with agricultural advancement throughout the South, and, though the *American Farmer* constituted his greatest single contribution, Southern men followed him to his other papers and continued to profit by his efforts. He was a pioneer among the agricultural editors who strove to awaken and advance the South. He heads a list that can be mentioned here only by name and paper: David Wiley of the *Agricultural Museum* (Georgetown, D. C.); Theoderick McRoberts of the *Virginia Farmer* (Scottsville, Va.); E. P. Roberts and Samuel Sands of the *Farmer and Gardener* and *American Farmer* (Baltimore, Md.); J. D. Legaré and G. R. Carroll of the early *Southern Agriculturist* (Charleston, S. C.) and A. G. Summer and William Summer of the later one (Laurensville, S. C.); J. W. Jones, James Camak, Daniel Lee, and D. Redmond of the *Southern Cultivator* (Augusta, Ga.); John Sherwood of the *Farmer's Advocate* (Jamestown, N. C.); N. B. Cloud and Charles A. Peabody of the *American Cotton Planter* (Montgomery, Ala.); T. C. Botts, J. M. Daniels, R. B. Gooch, and F. G. Ruffin of the *Southern Planter* (Richmond, Va.); and last, but far from least, J. D. B. De Bow of the *Commercial Review* (New Orleans, La.).<sup>32</sup>

But the greatest name of the new period was that of Edmund Ruffin of Virginia. Improved farmer, scientific investigator, editor

<sup>31</sup> This paper was known as the *Farmer and Gardener* for a time, but resumed its original name when Skinner returned as editor in 1839. It kept the name when Samuel Sands assumed control to allow Skinner to become assistant postmaster general in 1841.

<sup>32</sup> It is not the intention to give a complete list of the editors of all the agricultural papers started in the South in this period. There were perhaps others who deserve mention but the writer has not been able personally to inspect and evaluate such papers as *The Soil of the South* (Macon, Ga.), the *North Carolina Farmer* (Raleigh, N. C.), the *Farmer's Gazette* (Sparta, Ga.), the *Planter's Banner* (La.), the *Alabama Planter* (Tuscaloosa, Ala.), and the *Valley Farmer* (Winchester, Va.), and has hesitated to include their editors among a list that, after a rather close study, seems to merit attention. The *Agricultural Museum* antedates Skinner's *American Farmer*, and is, I believe, the first agricultural paper established in the United States. The *Museum* began publication in 1810, and while it was able to continue only for a few years it maintained a high standard. The *Farmer's Register* has been intentionally omitted from this list, because of its treatment later under Edmund Ruffin's work.

of the greatest agricultural paper of the time, reformer by virtue of intense agricultural interests and unbounded Southern patriotism, he belonged to the South as a whole rather than to any single state, and did a work for agriculture that reached almost to the dignity of statesmanship.<sup>33</sup> At a time when men were fleeing the older sections of the South or sinking into direst poverty, Ruffin began his work at Coggin's Point with a trial of John Taylor's methods. They failed him, and in desperation he struck out on new lines in an effort to rebuild his depleted soils. His investigations led him to the conclusion that the great trouble lay in an increasing acidity of soil produced by the excessive and unscientific cropping of the past. He noticed that where lands abounded in calcareous materials to the destruction of acidity, there fertility remained, and sedge, sorrel, and pine were absent. He reasoned that if a neutralizer could be applied to the so-called "exhausted soils" then their latent fertility would assert itself and manures become truly effective.<sup>34</sup> He put his ideas to test by the use of marl, and increased yields of from forty to fifty per cent. proved to his satisfaction that his theories were correct. He early presented the results of his experiments, together with his plans for reform, to the local agricultural society, and later developed them into his famed book called *Essay on Calcareous Manures*—a work which, at the end of the century, an expert in the United States Department of Agriculture declared to be the most thorough piece of writing on an agricultural subject ever published in the English language.<sup>35</sup>

In 1832 he founded the *Farmer's Register*, which John Skinner called "the best publication on agriculture which this country or Europe has ever produced", and which, in De Bow's quaint wording, "exhibited" in all its attractions "the noble science of agriculture" and by its diffusion "of rich stores of scientific and practical information" aroused "the energies and dispelled the lethargy" of the Old South.<sup>36</sup>

Opposition to the editor's attitude on the bank question combined with financial losses to bring the *Register* to an end in 1842 but Ruffin continued his reforms as a member of Virginia's first state Board of

<sup>33</sup> H. G. Ellis, *John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph-Macon College*, vol. III., no. 2, pp. 99-123; De Bow's *Commercial Review*, XI. 431-436; Diary of Edmund Ruffin (Library of Congress, MS.).

<sup>34</sup> *Farmer's Register*, VII. 659-667; *American Farmer*, fourth ser., VII. 293; first ser., III. 313-319; *Essay on Calcareous Manures*, *passim*.

<sup>35</sup> W. P. Cutter, *Yearbook of United States Department of Agriculture*, 1895, p. 493.

<sup>36</sup> *Richmond Enquirer*, June 18 and Aug. 2, 1833, Nov. 11, 1834; De Bow's *Commercial Review*, XI. 435.

Agriculture and later as agricultural commissioner for the state Agricultural Society.<sup>37</sup> In the meantime he became agricultural surveyor of South Carolina and found time to bring out new editions of his *Essay on Calcareous Manures* and to publish in 1855 a new volume called *Essays and Notes on Agriculture*.<sup>38</sup> His reports from official positions together with his addresses to the various agricultural societies round out a full statement of his theories and practices.<sup>39</sup>

The use of marl on worn lands was ever the first step in Ruffin's system. But the wider application of manures, the continued growing of legumes, such as clover and field peas, the rotation of crops, the laying of covered drains, and better plowing of all kinds were held in equal esteem when once the first step had been taken.<sup>40</sup> His understanding of soil fertility and soil depletion was startlingly modern. He rejected the static notion of exhaustion by the removal of elements in plant growth, and insisted that the absence of organic matter, the physical condition of the soil, and the increase of acidity were far more important.<sup>41</sup> He was familiar with De Candolle's idea of toxicity from continued growth of like crops and urged objections that compel respect even to-day. So keenly did he diagnose the soil problems of his section and so wisely did he prescribe remedies that, where his teachings were heeded, decline ceased, emigration was checked, and, even though not one-twentieth of the lands had been touched, their values in lower Virginia increased by over \$30,000,000 in the twenty years before 1850. Wheat and corn yields tripled and quadrupled, and fields once "galled and gullied"

<sup>37</sup> *American Farmer*, fourth ser., VII. 293; *Farmer's Register*, IX. 618-619, 163-166, X. 155.

<sup>38</sup> Five editions of the *Essay on Calcareous Manures* were issued January, 1832; April, 1835, December, 1842 (supplement to volume X. of *Farmer's Register*), 1844, 1853. *Essays and Notes on Agriculture* published in 1855.

<sup>39</sup> *An Address on the Opposite Results of Exhausting and Fertilizing Systems of Agriculture*, read before the South Carolina Institute at its Fourth Annual Fair, Nov. 18, 1853 (Charleston, 1853); "Report to State Board of Agriculture on the Most Important Recent Improvements of Agriculture in Lower Virginia", *Farmer's Register*, X. 656-666; "Sketch of the Progress of Agriculture in Virginia and Causes of Depression", *ibid.*, III. 748-760; "Rotation of Crops", *Southern Planter*, XII. 289-305 (commissioner's communication); *Agricultural Survey of South Carolina* (Columbia, 1843). These are but a few of the most important writings which were issued in pamphlet form or printed in agricultural papers. He was a frequent contributor to the press throughout his entire life.

<sup>40</sup> *Southern Planter*, VI. 135-142; *Farmer's Register*, VII. 609-610; Diary of Edmund Ruffin, MS.; *Southern Planter*, XII. 329.

<sup>41</sup> *An Address on the Opposite Results of Exhausting and Fertilizing Systems of Agriculture*; Diary of Edmund Ruffin; *Farmer's Register*, VII. 609-610.

were described as growing rank with clover.<sup>42</sup> Ruffin had, indeed, as a contemporary said, erected to himself a monument in the restored soils of his state.<sup>43</sup>

But Ruffin's aim was not mere material prosperity. He was primarily interested in the upbuilding of the South as a section. The declining soils had limited Southern population, had lessened Southern political power in the national councils, and had put the South at the mercy of the industrial North in tariff and slavery conflicts. To restore his beloved section to power or to fit her for prosperous independence was his goal. The way lay through a restored fertility that would hold her population at home and enable her to keep pace with her rival in the contest for power. It was this ideal that led the great agricultural reformer to scatter the John Brown pikes to the Southern legislatures; to originate the "League of United Southerners" which Yancey adopted as his own; to become, as *Leslie's Weekly* said, "a political Peter the Hermit" going "about from Convention to Convention . . . preaching secession wherever he goes"; and, in the end, to fire the first gun at Sumter. It steeled an old man of seventy to fight through four long years of bitter warfare and to take his own life in grief at Lee's surrender. Edmund Ruffin, agriculturist, was also Edmund Ruffin, Southern patriot.<sup>44</sup>

A few other reformers of the period can be noticed only briefly. James H. Hammond of South Carolina, who occupies the almost unique position among farmers of not liking "what is old" and of knowing "hardly . . . anything old in corn or cotton planting but what is wrong", advocated and practised better plowing and drainage, the use of fertilizers, and especially the diversification of husbandry by grain and stock, leaving cotton to the newer West.<sup>45</sup>

N. B. Cloud of Alabama was a specialist in fertilizing;<sup>46</sup> Jethro V. Jones and David Dickson of Georgia, H. W. Vick and R. Abbey

<sup>42</sup> *Southern Planter*, XIV. 104, IX. 226-237; Diary of Edmund Ruffin (especially years 1858-1859); *Farmer's Register*, I. 606, VII. 114, VIII. 415-418, 484-497, X. 40.

<sup>43</sup> *American Farmer*, fourth ser., VII. 297.

<sup>44</sup> The Diary of Edmund Ruffin, MS., furnished the material from which this paragraph has been written. Day-by-day accounts are given of events and clippings from newspapers, etc.

<sup>45</sup> Elizabeth Merritt, *James H. Hammond*, Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, vol. XLI.; James H. Hammond, *An Address delivered before the South Carolina Institute, at the first Annual Fair, on the 20th November, 1849* (Charleston, 1849); Hammond Papers, Library of Congress, especially diary. The words quoted here are given in U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*, p. 216. See also *De Bow's Review*, pp. 24, 501-522.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, XIV. 194; U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*, p. 215.



together with the "Petit Gulf" group of Hunt, MacGruder, and Freeland in Mississippi, all acquired justly high reputations for the breeding of improved strains of cotton;<sup>47</sup> Dr. M. W. Phillips of Mississippi, Vardry McBee and William Elliott of South Carolina, R. Peters, J. V. and J. B. Jones of Georgia were advocates of all-round better farming and wider diversification of production;<sup>48</sup> Robert F. W. Allston of South Carolina did much for rice and P. A. Wilkinson, Valcour Aime, and Judge P. Rost labored to advance sugar methods in Louisiana.<sup>49</sup> These men, with those who have been named before, constituted a leadership in an agricultural reformation that by 1860 had taken advantage of improved markets to place Southern agriculture on the road toward sound development. The older regions had done most. They had overcome difficulties greater than those faced in any other part of the nation, and with an agricultural intelligence unequalled had solved the problem of restoration.<sup>50</sup> The leaders in the newer sections had done less, but they had been forced to combat the unbending purpose of the frontier to spend its natural wealth for immediate returns. They had, at least on the larger estates and in the better portions, done enough toward checking destructive practices and introducing a wider diversification of crops, to render the long-held notion of complete dependence upon the Northwest for food supplies the worst of myths.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>47</sup> *De Bow's Review*, XII. 192-193, 75, III. 1-7; L. H. Bailey, *Cyclopedia of American Agriculture*, IV. 567.

<sup>48</sup> F. L. Riley, "Diary of a Mississippi Planter", *Mississippi Historical Society Publications*, X. 305-481; *De Bow's Review*, XIII. 314-318, XII. 192-193.

<sup>49</sup> *Plantation Diary of the Late Mr. Valcour Aime* (New Orleans, 1878); *De Bow's Review*, III. 223-234, 417-428, 383-385, VI. 55-57, XII. 574, XVI. 535, XXIV. 321-324; *Oration delivered before the Agricultural and Mechanics Association of Louisiana on the 12th of May, 1845* (Philadelphia, 1845; copy in Howard Memorial Library, New Orleans). The names of Cyrus H. McCormick, Obed Hussy, John A. Seldon, Hill Carter, P. H. Steinbergen, W. W. Bowie, Col. Capron, and others might be included in a more detailed study of improvements.

<sup>50</sup> A. O. Craven, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-161.

<sup>51</sup> C. M. Thompson, "Southern Food Supply—1859-1860". A paper read at the meeting of the American Economic Association, at St. Louis, Dec. 28, 1926. Dean Thompson, after subtracting the exports, finds that the per capita value of food crops for the nation as a whole was \$45. Compared to this the lower Mississippi group of states averaged \$44; the middle Mississippi group (all slave) averaged \$72; and the upper Mississippi group \$74. Florida averaged \$38; South Carolina (excluding rice) \$38; North Carolina \$53; and Virginia \$48. The slave states taken as a whole showed a value average of \$53.

The per capita value of corn for the nation as a whole was just under \$24. In Louisiana it was \$21; in Georgia \$26; Mississippi \$33; Arkansas \$37; Tennessee \$42; Kentucky \$50; Missouri \$56; South Carolina \$19; North Carolina \$27; and Virginia \$22.

In slaughtered animals the national per capita value was \$6.77. Only three slave states—Louisiana, Florida, and Maryland—fell below this average.



Yet too much should not be claimed. Reform, as yet, had been confined largely to the production end of agriculture—a natural consequence of exploitive frontier beginnings—and many more complicated problems lay yet ahead. In a few places the problem of organization, division, and supervision of well-considered quantities of labor had been attacked and substantial progress made,<sup>52</sup> but the final step necessary in converting agriculture into a mature, well-established business undertaking, that is, the adjustment to and control of profitable markets through sound marketing methods, then as now, awaited the complete breakdown of returns from soil exploitation and increasing land values. The agricultural reformer of the ante-bellum South, like his kind in other times, gave his attention largely to the problems causing immediate discomfort.

AVERY O. CRAVEN.

The South as a whole fell slightly below the average in wheat production per capita, but if whites alone are counted the difference is not great. In peas, beans, and potatoes the South again showed an advantage, if sweet potatoes are included.

Professor Thompson finds that in four of the five most important cotton-growing counties in Mississippi the per capita value of food crops exceeded the national average; in one it reached \$78; in another \$63; and in another \$60.

<sup>52</sup> Especially on the larger plantations in Virginia and Maryland.

History

## NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

### THE ECONOMIC HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AS A FIELD OF STUDY<sup>1</sup>

IN an account of "Recent Work in French Economic History", published a year ago in the *Economic History Review*, Professor Sée was able to devote only a page to the great collection which since 1903 has been proceeding under the auspices of a special commission<sup>2</sup> appointed by the French government. The aims of the Commission were described in 1908 in this *Review*<sup>3</sup> and particular volumes of documents have been noticed, but it may not be amiss to indicate the present state of the enterprise and to suggest once more the opportunities it offers to American students for work upon the social and economic problems of the French Revolution.

Before the outbreak of the Great War the task directed by the Commission, both as regards the variety of the economic and social phenomena considered and the number of scholars whose services had been enlisted, promised to be one of the most significant experiments in co-operative research yet undertaken. The very conception of the Revolution seemed likely as a result to be broadened and renewed. Professor Aulard once remarked that there were two revolutions, one political, which was chiefly Parisian and bourgeoisie, and the other economic, chiefly provincial and peasant. It is only the first that has been adequately portrayed. The work of the Commission at first went forward rapidly. At its tenth anniversary the fact was noted that already fifty-seven volumes of documents had been published. Then came the war. The budget of the Commission was necessarily reduced, while the historical problems suggested by the war, belonging both to the diplomatic situation out of which it grew and to the economic or financial phases of the struggle itself, seemed of more urgent concern than changes which occurred nearly a century and a half ago. The consequence has been that the work

<sup>1</sup> The present note is based upon a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association at Rochester, Dec. 30, 1926.

<sup>2</sup> Commission de Recherche et de Publication des Documents relatifs à la Vie Économique de la Révolution.

<sup>3</sup> Pierre Caron, "A French Co-operative Historical Enterprise", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIII. 501-509. An earlier statement was included in an article by J. H. Robinson, "Tendencies in the Study of the French Revolution", *ibid.*, XI. 535-537. For reviews of particular volumes, see, especially, *ibid.*, XV. 377-384.

of the Commission has been proceeding more slowly, even since 1918. During the last ten years fifteen volumes have been published.

The Great War did not exert an influence wholly negative. Its tremendous experiences made several aspects of the Revolution comprehensible for the first time. Many writers never seemed aware of the strains which a world struggle brings upon economic life, and certainly the phenomena of such a struggle were present in 1793 as well as in 1917. The collapse of the assignat is an illustration. Writers before the war had little but caustic criticism for the financiers of the Revolutionary assemblies until the spectacle of the ruin of the mark and the almost equally tragic fate of the franc taught them the dimensions of the problem which baffled the Cambons and the Ramels. The same observation applies to the experiments in price-fixing in the mid-period of the Revolution, which formerly received scant attention—perhaps a paragraph or two written more in the spirit of sardonic humor than of sympathetic appreciation. The spectacle to-day of unemployment in countries which have attempted to restore or at least stabilize their currencies, while others with a depreciated currency enjoy industrial activity, should make the student curious to investigate the corresponding influence upon French foreign trade and the exchange market of the falling value of the assignat in 1791 and 1792, before foreign and civil war disorganized the industrial life of the country. Equally interesting would be a study of the transition to sound money, which began long before the assignat or the mandat was finally repudiated. Even more fundamental is the peasant movement, which constituted the irresistible ground-swell of the Revolution, and the importance of which has again been emphasized by the rôle assumed by the peasantry in Russia since 1917.

When the collection was originally projected the plan of the Commission called for no fewer than sixteen series of volumes upon as many phases of the economic or social history of the Revolution. Of these a beginning, at least to the extent of publishing the pertinent legislative decrees and administrative acts, has been made upon ten or eleven—abolition of feudal rights, sales of public, nationalized or confiscated, lands, agriculture, industry, including mines, commerce, direct taxation, grain supply, including the maximum, common lands, public relief. The history of money and prices is apparently now to have a special series instead of being regarded as a part of the problem of land sales. The same is true of the General Maximum. To facilitate the work of research on the part of editors of documents or of other students each series was to be provided with a volume containing notes on legislation together with the texts of laws, of ad-

ministrative acts and circulars. In the case of the series on land sales the publication of the texts has been made only in part<sup>4</sup> and within a year, although the first volume of documents appeared twenty years ago. All these volumes, which now number nine, are valuable instruments of work quite apart from the series of documents which they accompany. That upon direct taxes, a special source of governmental anxiety, fills more than a thousand pages with decrees and administrative decisions.<sup>5</sup>

The general collection is richest in volumes of cahiers, which now number thirty-six. As the publication of all cahiers is intended, it is obvious that parish cahiers predominate. Relatively few of these have hitherto been available. The large collection of cahiers in the first six volumes of the *Archives Parlementaires* contains chiefly the cahiers of towns or of the three estates of bailiwicks and seneschalates. Moreover, as M. Armand Brette has shown,<sup>6</sup> this particular selection was put together in great haste and without critical care. Any one who has gone through a sufficiently representative number of the parish cahiers is aware how much fresher is their picture of local and especially economic conditions than that given by the cahiers of larger subdivisions of the country, which abound in paragraphs of abstract statement and of political or constitutional schemes of reform.

Students of the cahiers know that it is often a delicate task of criticism to determine how far the statements or complaints embody actual local opinion and what is the result of propaganda. The editors of the cahiers published in the *Archives Parlementaires* did not touch this problem, even if they recognized its existence. They printed the cahiers as they found them. But the Commission directed its editors to determine the extent to which use was made of model cahiers and not to include articles copied from a given model or from the cahier of a neighboring parish. M. Gaston Martin has recently shown<sup>7</sup> how the reform party, utilizing the machinery of the Masonic lodges, of which many leaders were members, brought to

<sup>4</sup> *Recueil des Textes Législatifs et Administratifs concernant les Biens Nationaux*, t. I. (Paris, 1926), see brief review, p. 435.

<sup>5</sup> *Les Contributions Directes, Instruction et Notes* (Paris, 1915, pp. 1178). A volume of texts for the General Maximum is to appear with the *Bulletin* of the Commission for 1922-1923, which is in press. These bulletins were at first "trimestriel", later annual, now biennial, and contain, besides instructions to editors, studies on special problems, collections of documents which do not belong to a particular series, and legislative and administrative texts for several of the series.

<sup>6</sup> *Révolution Française*, XLVII. 5-27. M. Brette estimates that if the editors had published all the cahiers, as they alleged, it would have required two hundred volumes instead of the five and a fraction which they devoted to this purpose.

<sup>7</sup> *La Franc-Maçonnerie et la Préparation de la Révolution* (Paris, 1926), p. 167.

the parish assemblies the general programme, with its doctrines of natural rights and civil equality, and how the peasants then added their protest against village oppressions, heavy taxes, the defect of justice, and the burdens of their feudal dues. When these village cahiers were taken by deputies to the higher assemblies, to form the basis of the cahiers of the third estate of bailiwick or seneschalate, a reverse process set in. As M. Martin explains: "On ne peut pas conserver que les parties communes, et l'on en arrive ainsi, insidieusement, à ne se présenter à l'Assemblée qu'avec des *charges* politiques dont toute revendication locale était exclue." It is to the local and especially the parish cahiers, therefore, that we must look for the full picture of the social and economic situation in 1789. The material from which this must be drawn is already rich, although not so abundant for the region north or northwest of Paris. Twenty-five of the thirty-six volumes come from the west and south of France.

Of the many questions to which an attentive study of these cahiers will furnish an answer only one or two can be alluded to here. Of great interest is the attitude of the rural population toward the feudal framework which placed limits upon their property rights and hampered the development of agriculture. This question thrust itself forward as soon as the weakness of authority was revealed by the successful uprising in Paris. It is important to know how far public opinion in the parishes had gone before this event suggested a drastic solution of the problem. The reader of the cahiers is not infrequently surprised at the moderation of the requests touching this matter. The burden of taxation often seems to hold first place in the thought of those who drew up the cahiers. Summary abolition of dues is rarely indicated, but, rather, a moderate plan of redemption. There is room for as careful a survey of opinion upon this question as M. Roger Picard has made for the problems of industry.<sup>8</sup>

The study of this and related questions will be greatly facilitated when to the collection of cahiers are added the proposed volumes of documents concerned with the disappearance locally of the feudal dues and other remnants of the manorial system, either because of extinction by purchase or because their titular holders no longer ventured to collect them. Three years ago the Commission issued instructions governing the mode of editing such material, accompanying them with the pertinent legislative texts and administrative acts. M. Pierre Caron, the editor, remarks that only after the publication of documents and monographs for a sufficient number of localities will

<sup>8</sup> *Les Cahiers de 1789 et les Classes Ouvrières* (Paris, 1910).

it be possible to write a veritable history of the suppression of feudalism.<sup>9</sup>

The selection from the correspondence and other papers of the Committee on Feudal Dues,<sup>10</sup> which MM. Sagnac and Caron published for the Commission twenty years ago, illustrated the trend of public opinion and the difficulties in the path of successful legislation on the subject, but could not throw much light upon what actually took place.

An equally interesting question is the attitude expressed in the cahiers toward church property. For the general problem of church property, in addition to the cahiers, we have a series of volumes with the title *Ventes des Biens Nationaux*, which include sales of lands coming from the confiscation of the property of emigrant nobles and other proscribed persons as well as from that of the Church. This series is next in extent to that of the cahiers themselves and consists of fourteen volumes, representing seven departments—Bouches-du-Rhône, Haute-Garonne, Gironde, Ille-et-Vilaine, Rhône, Vosges, Yonne. In the case of the Bouches-du-Rhône and the Rhône the sales for the whole department are given, but in the other cases only for one or two important districts of each. It will be noted that the record of sales is scattered geographically, although southern France is somewhat more strongly represented. The volumes open with statements of the property held by the clergy or by the religious orders or other foundations of the district, based on their declarations made according to the decree of November 13, 1789, or inventories by local authorities, as decreed on March 20, 1790. The most important section deals with sales, including appraisals or estimates, the prices accepted at the sales, accompanied in many cases by the actual money value of the payments made or a list of payments on account by dates. The study of these prices is facilitated by the reprint of the official *Tableaux de Dépréciation du Papier-Monnaie* drawn up in the years V and VI, which M. Caron edited for the Commission in 1909. The Commission found that certain local archives were so rich in material on ecclesiastical property as to justify separate volumes on this phase of the problem. Only one has appeared, edited by M. A. Rebillon, and deals with the *Situation Économique du Clergé dans les Districts de Rennes, de Fougères, et de Vitré*.<sup>11</sup> As we have

<sup>9</sup> *Bulletin*, années 1920-1921 (Paris, 1924). Professor Aulard remarked in his *La Révolution Française et le Régime Féodal* (Paris, 1919) that as yet we know very little about two essential facts: first, whether dues continued to be paid until redemption; and second, how many peasants actually initiated the process of redemption.

<sup>10</sup> *Les Comités des Droits Féodaux et de Législation et l'Abolition du Régime Seigneurial, 1789-1793* (Paris, 1907).

<sup>11</sup> Rennes, 1913.

three volumes of cahiers for the seneschalate of Rennes, and a volume embodying the sales of public lands in the districts of Rennes and Bain, together with the volume just mentioned, it is clear that the material for the study of church property in that region at least is abundant.

In the study of the public lands during the Revolution many problems crowd upon the attention. The legislators of the day were clear as to the two most important, although their attitude varied with the moods, policies, or necessities of the moment. The primary motive of the seizure of ecclesiastical lands had been to find resources to save the country from bankruptcy. That bankruptcy was only deferred is too well known to require proof, but it is important to know as exactly as possible the resources the government drew from the sale of ecclesiastical lands as well as from that of the lands of the emigrant nobles. The statements of price and of payments which these documents contain render an approximate estimate possible. The editors of the documents in their introductions, which are often comprehensive, endeavor to sum up in statistical tables the evidence which the documents offer on this as on other questions. Another aim of the Constituent Assembly and of the Convention was to increase the number of small proprietors. The documents in this series will enable the student to supplement the conclusions drawn by Loutchisky and other scholars from their examination of the sales in certain localities. Other questions concern the bearing which political or factional struggles had upon the plans of sale and upon the success of the sales themselves. It has often been remarked that the legislation of 1793 and 1794 directed against the so-called rich could hardly be expected to increase the enthusiasm of prospective purchasers. If graphs were constructed, utilizing the material in these documents, showing the extent of sales in typical regions month by month, these influences could be studied to advantage.<sup>12</sup>

For the study of price-fixing and the General Maximum only a few additional volumes of documents have appeared during the past decade.<sup>13</sup> Two have been published containing the *procès-verbaux* and acts of the Commission of Subsistence<sup>14</sup> created in October,

<sup>12</sup> Another phase of the land question is illustrated by L. Dubreuil, *Les Vicissitudes du Domaine Congéable en Basse-Bretagne à l'Époque de la Révolution* (Rennes, 1915, 2 vols.).

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion based on the documents available in 1917, see this *Review*, XXIII. 107-113. The questions which remain to be studied are suggested by Professor A. Mathiez in his recent work on *La Vie Chère et le Mouvement Social sous la Terreur* (Paris, 1927).

<sup>14</sup> Pierre Caron, *La Commission des Subsistances de l'An II, Procès-Verbaux et Actes* (Paris, 1925, 2 vols.).



1793, to enforce the Maximum and to control requisitions and other activities touching the question of supplies. On November 1 this commission was entrusted with the task of establishing the new *Tableau Général du Maximum* which was to replace the price lists voted on September 29. The records of the commission do not throw much light (as its editor, M. Caron, points out) upon the mode by which the *Tableau* was prepared, to say nothing of its enforcement, which had hardly begun when the commission was dissolved. There remains the obscure problem of the enforcement of the Maximum of September 29, condemned in principle by the report of Barère in the name of the Committee of Public Safety, in the interval before the new plan could go into effect. Light upon this must await the publication of documents for a sufficient number of localities. Meanwhile three volumes have been added in the series on "Substances", a second volume for the district of Bergues and two for the district of Versailles. These are valuable for the history of the maximum on grain and for the system of requisitions. For the study of the situation in Paris the completion of the reports of the "observers" Grivel and Siret is fortunate.<sup>15</sup>

Closely connected with the history of the Maximum is that of money and prices. The records of the Committee of Finance of the Constituent Assembly are now available.<sup>16</sup> There had previously been printed a volume of "Textes et Notes"<sup>17</sup> on paper money and the tables of depreciation already mentioned. The local history of money and prices is the object of the series which these volumes introduce, but in which as yet no volume has appeared. It was suggested earlier in this article that the study of the effect upon French foreign trade of the depreciation of the assignats would be of interest. M. Charles Schmidt, one of the leading members of the Commission, suggested some years ago<sup>18</sup> the advantage of exploring foreign archives and collections for the correspondence of ambassadors, consuls, and individuals to note the influence of the Revolution upon commerce and the way in which the new legislation re-

<sup>15</sup> *Bulletin* for 1920-1921. The earlier collection of reports upon subsistence appeared in the *Bulletin* for 1907. Those reports belonging to the period prior to 27 Nivôse, An II, are also included in a more comprehensive collection which M. Caron had begun to publish with the title of *Paris pendant la Terreur, Rapports des Agents Secrets du Ministre de l'Intérieur* (Paris, 1910, 1914, 2 vols.).

<sup>16</sup> *Procès-Verbaux du Comité des Finances de l'Assemblée Constituante*, ed. Camille Bloch (Rennes, 1922, 1923, 2 vols.).

<sup>17</sup> *La Monnaie et le Papier-Monnaie, Instruction, Recueil de Textes et Notes* (Paris, 1912).

<sup>18</sup> *Assemblée Générale du Comité Central et des Comités Départementaux des 3-5 Février, 1913*, p. 8; *Bulletin*, 1913, p. 362.

acted upon French economic relations abroad. Of course, the four volumes of the records of the committees on agriculture and commerce,<sup>19</sup> of which M. Schmidt was one of the joint editors, throw some light on this question. Another available source is the correspondence of the Minister of the Interior with relation to commerce during the spring and summer of 1792.<sup>20</sup>

It is not possible here to do more than allude to other documentary material published by the Commission<sup>21</sup>—volumes on commons, on poverty and public relief, on industry and especially mines, on direct taxation. Even a brief survey must make evident the immense service which the Commission has been rendering and what a notable addition it has made to the material previously available. The field is rich and deserves more attention than has hitherto been accorded to it by American students.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

#### JEFFERSON AND THE LECLERC EXPEDITION

THE general story of American relations with the former French colony of St. Domingo, based on materials to be found in this country, has been ably told by Dr. Treudley.<sup>1</sup> As regards the situation in 1801 when the United States government, having recently signed a peace convention with France and not yet divining Bonaparte's colonial programme, withdrew its support from Toussaint Louverture,<sup>2</sup> certain documents in the Paris archives throw still further light. The Pichon despatches, for example, show that Jefferson was personally eager to see the French restore their authority in the island; and the effect of his words suggesting Anglo-French co-operation in the West Indies to this end is reflected in other papers,

<sup>19</sup> *Procès-Verbaux des Comités d'Agriculture et de Commerce de la Constituante, de la Législative et de la Convention*, ed. F. Gerbaux and Charles Schmidt (Paris, 1906-1910, 4 vols.).

<sup>20</sup> *Correspondance du Ministère de l'Intérieur relatif au Commerce, etc.*, ed. A. Tuetey (Paris, 1917).

<sup>21</sup> *Le Partage des Biens Communaux*, ed. G. Bourgin (Paris, 1908). *Procès-Verbaux et Rapports du Comité de Mendicité de la Constituante (1790-1791)*, ed. Camille Bloch and Alexandre Tuetey (Paris, 1911). *Recueil de Documents sur l'Assistance Publique dans le District de Toulouse de 1789 à 1800*, ed. J. Adher (Toulouse, 1918). *L'Industrie Sidéurgique en France au Début de la Révolution, Documents*, ed. H. and G. Bourgin (Paris, 1920).

<sup>1</sup> Mary Treudley, "The United States and Santo Domingo, 1789-1866", in *The Journal of Race Development*, VII. (1916-1917) 83-145, 220-274.

<sup>2</sup> Owing largely to trade advantages in the island and the quarrel with the French, the Adams administration had favored the rule of this negro leader, who had made the colony virtually independent. See "Letters of Toussaint Louverture and of Edward Stevens, 1798-1800", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XVI. 64-101.

particularly in the correspondence between Talleyrand and Otto, the French envoy in London.

Louis André Pichon had come to America at this time representing the new French policy of conciliation. And since the underlying motive of this policy was the recovery of the colonies in the Antilles he exerted himself to find out whether the Americans were meddling with these possessions.<sup>3</sup> His worst fears in this regard were confirmed on a trip to the north in June, 1801, as the American ships arriving daily in New York from St. Domingo were maintaining an absolute silence on events there.<sup>4</sup> Then, too, common opinion had it that "the black Toussaint Louverture is considering independence projects". Both Frenchmen and Americans considered necessary an imposing force and even joint action with neighboring powers if France were to succeed in regaining control over the colony.

Upon his return to the capital, Pichon did not hesitate to visit the federal authorities themselves in order to get their views on the situation. In an interview with Madison on July 11, he asked the Secretary of State what information the government had received from its consuls in St. Domingo.<sup>5</sup> He also hinted that he would like to see the instructions of these agents as an indication of confidence which would be appreciated by the First Consul. In reply the Secretary merely stated the American position with respect to the island. The United States, he declared, desired only to continue their trade with the colony where they "*were taking things just as they were without pretending to judge them*". While it would do nothing to the detriment of the rights and prerogatives of France, the administration could not risk becoming embroiled with Toussaint. Moreover, according to reports, everything was being prepared in St. Domingo for an early declaration of independence. Madison added the small consolation that in his personal opinion neither England nor the United States would seriously favor such an event.

Instead of reporting immediately these remarks to his government, Pichon waited nine days and then went, as was his custom, to make one of his informal calls on the President. He found him all

<sup>3</sup> In his *Raport [sic] aux Consuls de la République*, of Nov. 30, 1799 (Arch. Nat., AFIV. 1681A), Talleyrand had urged the sending of a new consular agent to the United States in order "to fathom what is going on with respect to our colonies".

<sup>4</sup> Pichon to Minister of Marine and Colonies, New York, June 3, 1801. French State Papers, vol. I., 1798-1802, Adams Transcripts in the Library of Congress.

<sup>5</sup> Pichon to Talleyrand, July 20, 1801 (Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, vol. 53, no. 84, f. 169). For aid in finding this and the following reference, I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Messrs. Doysié and Leland, who very kindly placed at my disposal in Paris the manuscript guide to materials on American history in the French archives, prepared for the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

alone and in a very communicative mood, hence the prolonged conversation which ensued.<sup>6</sup> It opened with a question from the President as to whether Pichon had any news from St. Domingo. Upon receiving a negative answer, Jefferson replied that although nothing had yet been heard from Mr. Lear, the new agent general of the United States to the island, he had it on good authority that Toussaint would soon declare himself. This gave Pichon an opportunity to bring up the subject of his interview with Madison. He asked permission to indicate his concern over that conversation, declaring that he was unable to judge from the equivocal and reserved language of the Secretary of State whether or not the United States favored the plans of Toussaint. The President hastened to assure him that his administration did not approve them. But so long as France remained powerless to act nothing could be done. The trade of the island was extremely important to the United States, and if the government considered prohibiting this traffic, it would unnecessarily get into difficulties with Toussaint and seriously compromise itself in public opinion. Pichon, on his part, then expressed his belief in the utility to both nations of this commerce, which, if interrupted, would cause Toussaint to turn to the English; he merely wanted to be well assured that the projects of the black leader would in no wise be approved. Jefferson repeated his assurance. He also told his visitor that far from excluding American commerce from St. Domingo, Toussaint would be afraid that if it stayed away the English would not be able to supply him with provisions. At this point Pichon felt encouraged to put his big question: If France were in a position to act, would it not be possible to arrange a concert with the United States in order to accomplish more quickly the conquest of the colony? And the compromising reply came: "Without difficulty; but in order that this concert may be complete and effective you must [first] make peace with England; then nothing would be easier than to furnish your army and fleet with everything, and to reduce Toussaint to starvation."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Pichon to Talleyrand, July 22, 1801 (Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, vol. 53, ff. 177-184). In view of the happy outcome of this visit, it is interesting to compare it with those which Otto, the French envoy in London, was making to the English ministers at the same time. Referring to Lord Hawkesbury, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that diplomat wrote to Talleyrand on October 27, 1801: "I soon discovered that I obtained much more by unexpected visits than by rendezvous previously agreed upon. Therefore, I have adopted the policy of going to him at any hour and without notifying him in advance. It was in these moments of abandon that the restoration of Malta, of Martinique, and of other important places, was conceded." Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 597, no. 13, ff. 30-31.

<sup>7</sup> The last phrase of this sentence proved vigorous enough to suit even Bonaparte; see *infra*. Professor Channing says of the third President: "Jefferson's

This declaration evidently went beyond the fondest hopes of the delighted Pichon, for he styled it "very important" and "indeed agreeable to hear". But he was not yet satisfied; the French diplomats of that time knew scarcely more moderation than their master. And so we find him next requesting the President kindly to communicate what Mr. Lear had written. Apparently he doubted the truth of Jefferson's earlier statement that no information had come from that agent, for, in his words, the President now "limited himself" to replying that they had no news of him.<sup>8</sup> Still the latter continued to chat on in a friendly vein, untroubled by the persistence of the French envoy. Pichon should not think there was a sentiment in the United States favorable to Toussaint. Was not the negro a menace to two-thirds of the states? Did not England herself have everything to fear from him? "She would doubtless participate in a concert to suppress this rebellion, and independently of her fears for her own colonies, I am sure", he said, "she is observing like us how St. Domingo is becoming another Algiers (*un Alger*)<sup>9</sup> in the seas of America."

A month and a half later Pichon, in a letter to France, repeated as his own opinion Jefferson's belief that England would be willing to co-operate with France in crushing Toussaint, alluding at the same time however to the information he had recently sent to the Minister of Foreign Affairs on the views of the American government.<sup>10</sup> Even though the English were gaining commercially from the present situation of St. Domingo, he thought they would not seriously support its independence; the government in Jamaica had already displayed a reserved attitude towards the island.

In Paris these despatches from Pichon were carefully scrutinized and acted upon as soon as the opportunity presented itself. Nor was bellicose attitude in the early years of his presidency is well worth bearing in mind in view of his later determination to keep the United States out of the world-wide war regardless of what seemed to many persons to be the national honor." *A History of the United States* (New York, 1905-1925), IV. 271.

<sup>8</sup> It seems that Lear's letter to Madison dated July 17, in which he spoke of Toussaint's cool reception to him because he had not brought a personal letter from Jefferson, was his first from St. Domingo. Treudley, *loc. cit.*, VII. 140.

<sup>9</sup> Jefferson might easily have used the term, Tripoli, with which state the United States was then at war. Perhaps he associated Algiers with St. Domingo because trouble was brewing there, too, but hostilities had not actually broken out. That Algiers was on his mind is apparent from a letter of June 11, in which he commented on the "ill humor" of that Barbary power to which three years of tribute were due. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. Ford (New York, 1892-1899), VIII. 62-65.

<sup>10</sup> Pichon to Minister of Marine and Colonies, Sept. 5, 1801. French State Papers, Adams Transcripts, vol. I., 1798-1802.

action long delayed. The extended peace negotiations with England came to an auspicious end on October 1, and the following week General Leclerc, a brother-in-law of Bonaparte, was summoned to head an expedition to be sent against Toussaint.<sup>11</sup> Orders were given for the assembling of the necessary ships and men in several French ports.<sup>12</sup> Following Jefferson's suggestion, the government not only made no attempt to conceal its plans from England but even approached that power for support in carrying them out.

The first indications of the American influence are to be noted in Talleyrand's letter of October 16, addressed to Otto.<sup>13</sup> If questioned concerning the naval preparations at Brest, the envoy is to answer without hesitation that they are intended for St. Domingo. But, as a matter of fact, the minister continued, the British government can regard only "with pleasure an expedition whose aim is to restore the colony of St. Domingo to a state of organization such that it will no longer be a dangerous neighbor to the European colonies in the Antilles". Four days later, Talleyrand wrote again at the command of the First Consul, asking Otto to inform Lord Hawkesbury that two fleets were being assembled, one at Brest and the other at Rochefort, "in order to carry ten or twelve thousand troops to St. Domingo for the purpose of re-establishing order there".<sup>14</sup>

The response of the English ministry to these communications gave the Paris government every reason to believe that the American President had interpreted English sentiments correctly. Otto was told in return that the government was sending a small squadron to the English colonists in the Antilles.<sup>15</sup> Addington invited him to spend a morning at Wimbledon and there made the categorical assertion: "The interest of the two governments is absolutely the same, namely, the destruction of Jacobinism [in general] and that of the blacks in particular." The ministry, he went on, did not care how many troops were sent; it merely hoped that they would be sufficient to re-establish good order in the French colonies. The prime minister asked but one thing: advices with respect to the number of ships assembling at Brest in order that he might be in a position to reply to the "new party of the opposition".

A week after Otto reported this meeting, Bonaparte instructed his foreign minister to give the English Cabinet the information re-

<sup>11</sup> Bonaparte to Berthier, Oct. 8, 1801. *Correspondance de Napoléon I<sup>er</sup>* (Paris, 1858-1870), vol. VII., no. 5787.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. VII., nos. 5786, 5803, 5822, 5825-5827.

<sup>13</sup> Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 597, no. 6, f. 16.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 597, no. 9, f. 19.

<sup>15</sup> Otto to Talleyrand, Oct. 23, 1801, *ibid.*, no. 10, ff. 20-21.



quested.<sup>16</sup> In this letter Jefferson's term for St. Domingo is first employed, but the form is changed from "un Alger" to "la nouvelle Alger". After listing the number of vessels in the various ports, which are to convey General Leclerc and twenty thousand troops to America, he concludes: "I should like to have the British government give orders at Jamaica to supply him with all the provisions he may need, it being the interest of civilization to destroy the new Algiers which is organizing itself in the midst of America." Talleyrand also used the expression the following day in writing to Otto when he asserted that "the enterprise in preparation to-day can not be too prompt, too complete, or too deserving of favor from all states with colonies and commerce".<sup>17</sup>

The minister now assisted Bonaparte in drawing up secret instructions for Leclerc.<sup>18</sup> The first two paragraphs of the second chapter of this document dealing with foreign affairs clearly betray the hand of the experienced diplomat; the choice of words is much the same as that found in Talleyrand's despatches to Otto. The chapter begins: "The Spaniards, the English, and the Americans look upon the Black Republic with equal anxiety." Then the admiral and captain-general of the expedition are directed to send circulars to the neighboring colonies, acquainting them with the object of the government and pointing out "the common advantage to the Europeans in destroying this black rebellion". In the next paragraph Talleyrand anticipates the consent of the English to the giving of the aid asked of them in the West Indies and which he had requested only that day, by writing: "If necessary, provisions may be asked for in America, in the Spanish islands, and even in Jamaica." As to the reference to the procuring of supplies in America, it was quite in accord with the spirit of Jefferson's remark to Pichon that "nothing would be easier than to furnish your army and fleet with everything". Bonaparte's interpretation of the President's words might be questioned. It is to be found, couched in unmistakable Napoleonic language, at the close of the chapter: "Jefferson has promised that the instant[!] the French army arrives all[!] measures will be taken to reduce Toussaint

<sup>16</sup> Oct. 30, 1801. *Corresp. de Nap.*, vol. VII., no. 5845.

<sup>17</sup> Talleyrand to Otto, Oct. 31, 1801. *Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre*, vol. 597, no. 23, f. 41.

<sup>18</sup> Notes pour servir aux instructions à donner au capitaine général Leclerc, Oct. 31, 1801 (*Arch. Nat.*, AFIV. 863, and printed in Gustav Roloff, *Die Kolonialpolitik Napoleons I.*, Munich and Leipzig, 1899, pp. 244-254). This manuscript is hidden away among the minutes of Bonaparte's correspondence, and thus escaped the notice of researchers in the history of the St. Domingo expedition until Dr. Roloff discovered it. There are two copies, the second with Bonaparte's signature and a number of corrections in his hand being a revised draft of the first.



to starvation and to aid the army."<sup>19</sup> To have lived up to the letter of this statement, the President would have been obliged at least to prohibit all American trade with St. Domingo save that with Leclerc. But the day of his embargo ventures had not yet dawned.

CARL LUDWIG LOKKE.

MANUSCRIPT MAPS RELATING TO AMERICAN HISTORY IN FRENCH,  
SPANISH, AND PORTUGUESE ARCHIVES

It has long been known that there are in European archives hundreds of manuscript maps relating to different phases of American history. Many of these maps have not been used by historians, because of the difficulties attendant upon having access to them even when abroad. In October of 1926 the William L. Clements Library at Ann Arbor authorized Professor Louis C. Karpinski to secure photographs of all the manuscript maps in French archives relating to the American Revolution. Shortly thereafter it was decided to enlarge this project and to attempt to secure the reproduction of all the manuscript maps in official French archives relating to the present area of the United States and Alaska. Maps relating wholly to northern Canada and maps relating solely to Mexico and the West Indies were not included in this project since that would so greatly have increased the expense of the undertaking.

In this larger project the active and most helpful co-operation of the Library of Congress was immediately obtained, as well as the participation of the New York Public Library, the Huntington Library, and the Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library. These four

<sup>19</sup> In return for this assistance the First Consul had no intention that the United States should profit commercially from the conquest of the colony. He states specifically in the last chapter of the instructions that French goods are to be purchased in preference to American, even at a loss of fifteen per cent.; later, only French ships are to be admitted to the island. The Americans were merely to gain relief from the menace of a possible slave insurrection, incited by Toussaint's example.

In his brilliant work on the administrations of Jefferson and Madison, Henry Adams appears to have confused the secrecy attending the French negotiations for the retrocession of Louisiana with that surrounding the plans in 1801 to regain the island colonies. He writes concerning the preparations in October for the Leclerc expedition: "As yet President Jefferson had no inkling of their meaning" (*History of the United States*, I. 390). For obvious reasons it was only Toussaint Louverture who was deceived and kept in ignorance at this time as regards the intentions of the Paris government. The Pichon despatches of July 20 and 22 and Leclerc's instructions would seem to contain ample proof that the President favored such an enterprise in principle, and knew that the French would act as soon as their hands were free. Of course, he was not yet informed about the trade restrictions which Bonaparte proposed to put into effect.

institutions, with the William L. Clements Library, extended the undertaking to include the reproduction of manuscript maps in Spanish and Portuguese archives.

The French series as completed includes about 100 photographs from the Bibliothèque Nationale, more than 300 from the Service Hydrographique de la Marine, about 200 from the Ministry of War (État Major and Service Technique du Génie), 12 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 12 from the Ministry of Colonies, 15 from the National Archives, and three from the Arsenal Library. In every instance in France and Portugal the active interest and support of the official librarians was immediately given to the project. The same was true almost everywhere in Spain.

Some two-hundred-odd photographs were obtained in Madrid at the Biblioteca Nacional, the Ministry of War, the Ministry of Marine, the Naval Museum, and the wonderful private library of the Duke of Alba. At Seville the active co-operation of the director of the Archivo General de Indias and of Mr. José de la Peña was secured. A few maps listed by the learned Don Pedro Torres Lanzas were not to be found but that is not a matter of surprise in a place which houses so many hundreds of thousands of documents as the Archives of the Indies. In Portugal the active assistance of the American minister, Hon. Fred M. Dearing, opened the way to immediate access to official archives, even though the work was done between two revolutions. The Duchess of Palmella courteously gave permission for the reproduction of an early portulan in the Palmella palace, a portulan of the sixteenth century by John of Lisbon.

It will be difficult to single out individual maps as being particularly noteworthy. The photographic reproduction of the Juan de la Cosa map in two photographs 45 x 55 cm. gives the first satisfactory copy of the first map to present the new world. The photographs of the Vaz Dourado Atlas in the private library of the Duke of Alba were obtained with the courteous permission of the duke, whose interest in learning is well known.

In France the reproduction of a large number of Franquelin maps not hitherto available, or not readily accessible, is noteworthy. Further the series of some 200 photographs of maps relating to the French participation in the American Revolution gives material, hitherto almost inaccessible, which will doubtless throw considerable light upon many of the campaigns of the American Revolution.

In addition to the five libraries mentioned above the complete series of reproductions from French archives is available in the Burton Historical Collection in the Detroit Public Library, in the

John Carter Brown Library, Harvard University, the University of Illinois, the Western Reserve Historical Society, the Cleveland Public Library, the Indiana Historical Society, the University of Minnesota, the Grosvenor Library in Buffalo, and Dartmouth College Library. The maps relating to the American Revolution are also available in the Boston Public Library. All of the maps relating to New York have been secured by the New York State Library and those relating to Florida by the Florida Historical Society.

Arrangements have been made so that any libraries which desire to secure these maps may do so by writing to the undersigned at the University of Michigan.

LOUIS C. KARPINSKI.

## DOCUMENTS

### *Despatches from the United States Consulate in New Orleans, 1801-1803, II.*

#### IV. DANIEL CLARK TO SECRETARY MADISON.

NEW ORLEANS 8 March 1803

(Confidential)

I arrived here from Europe on the night of the 25th ulto. and was sensibly hurt tho' by no means surprised at the Steps taken by the Intendant in my absence, and which cause an incalculable injury to the Trade of the Western Country. In the last Letter I had the Honor of writing to you from hence<sup>1</sup> I pointed out what he had then done in violation of the Treaty, his ideas of what he was authorised to do and those of the Prime Minister of Spain with respect to the duty of 6 per cent on our imports and exports deposited here which he had ordered to be levied but which as the Intendant himself mentioned to me he thought too glaring an infringement of our rights to put in execution. The measures lately adopted are in my opinion but preparatory to others more injurious and are merely intended to try our dispositions and how long we shall patiently submit to injuries, they have chosen the moment when the cession of the Province to France was announced to develop pretensions which she will persist in, and I fear we shall at last find it difficult to obtain redress. On the subject of the authority on which the Intendant has acted, there is among well informed People but one Opinion which is, that he merely executes the orders received from his Government. He is too rich, too sensible, and too cautious to take such a responsibility on himself especially after meeting for such a length of time so decided an opposition from the Governor who in his official Correspondence on the subject which I have seen, says that the measures proposed were a direct and open violation of the Treaty. It is much to be regretted that the Secretary of this Province Dn. Andres Lopez de Armesto and the Auditor or Judge, Dn. Nicolas Maria Vidal by whose opinion the Governor is guided are not men of firmness; as the old man tho almost incapable of an exertion from Age and infirmities would nevertheless have ordered the Intendant to be suspended from the exercise of his functions, had not his two Counsellors been wavering and indecisive and at last overawed by the tone and Spirit of the Intendant advised him to a compliance with the latters wishes. This determined Spirit of the Intendant is not natural to him, it is assumed because he feels himself supported, and you will recollect an expression of his which I formerly communicated that he was careless of the consequences of measures which he undertook in compliance with orders. In a conversation with the Auditor whom I reproached for submitting to the will of

<sup>1</sup> No. II., *supra*, vol. XXXII., pp. 815-822.

the Intendant he assured me that he had only done so on the perfect conviction that he had orders from the Minister to that effect, and desired me to recollect, that in the most trifling matters which involved any responsibility, the assessor or himself were always consulted as his Guides on the occasion, for supported by the Opinion of one or the other he is discharged from all blame but if he acts without it he then takes the risk upon himself, and that he never would have dared to take so momentary an affair upon his own responsibility without consulting any one, unless his orders had been express and so plain as to admit of no other interpretation whatever, and I could not avoid acknowledging the justness of his observation. It is a painful reflection but it is indispensable to mention it, that for many years past all the People in high offices in this Country have constantly informed the Court of Spain, that our Government was not to be feared, that it had no influence over our Western Settlements and that all the leading Characters in them could be easily brought over to assist any views of the Spanish Government however inimical to those of their own Country; that they were egregiously deceived in their information in general is too well known a fact to say much upon, but that they may have found among us a few men base enough to encourage expectations of this kind I have no doubt and perhaps on a strict Scrutiny by our Government something might transpire which would lead to a discovery and thus foreign Nations bordering on our Frontier would perceive how grossly they had erred in their opinions respecting us, and their measures in future might be more consonant to Justice and the faith of Treaties. That the French are coming here with expectations of support from our own people and the most contemptible opinion of our Strength and resources and I firmly believe a determined resolution to injure us essentially on all occasions I have already mentioned in my letters to you from Europe and I regret that we cannot be beforehand with them and take possession of a Place now offered us by the Inhabitants, without which we shall never be in safety, which we must one day occupy and the conquest of which may then cost much blood, lives and treasure. The Inhabitants are now so alarmed, that Creoles, Spaniards and Americans would form but one body, they would now without bloodshed take the Government into their own hands and they would inseparably unite themselves to us; they cry out against our temporising when our dearest interests imperiously call upon us to embrace the favorable moment for acting and they tremble when they see it pass and themselves on the point of falling under the lash of a Government they detest and in whose cause they may be afterwards by a military force obliged to sacrifice their lives, by bearing Arms against us whom they now invite as deliverers. All is at present here anxious and dreadful suspense and on your resolutions the hopes and happenings of the Country depend, there is now nothing to oppose us should we think proper to take possession of the Country either by way of indemnification for past injuries or security for the future, there is no energy in the Government, no money in the Treasury, no Troops, no fortifications that could withstand us for a moment and the Inhabitants call on us to redress ourselves, and assist them; if so favorable a conjunctive passes, its like will never occur again. [<sup>2</sup>As a proof that expectations of assistance from

<sup>2</sup> The passage here bracketed, extending from this point to the end of the next paragraph with the omission (as indicated) of one sentence, is similarly marked with pencilled brackets in the manuscript, and with the pencilled heading, "Extract

ourselves against our own Government have been always relied on by the Spaniards and that they have constantly looked to a division of our Western States from the general government I now forward you an order to receive from Washington Morton Esqr. of New York a sealed Packet which I left in his possession when I set out for Europe and which I then mentioned I would show you at my return, not thinking at that time that Circumstances would occur so soon as to render the disclosure a measure of immediate necessity. Among other Papers of less importance in this packet, is a small part of the Correspondence of the Baron de Carondelet with the officer commanding Fort St. Ferdinand at the Chicasaw Bluffs<sup>3</sup> in which he suffers his Plans and Views to be clearly perceived, and which were solely aimed at our destruction, the remainder are as well as I recollect Copies of talks and Letters to and from the Chicasaw Indians, and by the Baron de Carondelets Letters to the officer you will perceive that the fact I advised you of respecting the annual pension of 500 dollars to Uguluycabé<sup>4</sup> cannot be disputed.] As the officer from whom I received these Papers is still in this Country and has all his Property in it, I rely on your Prudence not to publish these Papers as he would become the Victim of his attachment to us, which alone induced him to put them into my possession. [Should you think these documents of sufficient importance to require my presence in Washington to elucidate any part of them I shall immediately sacrifice all private Business of my own, and hasten there, and in the mean time will endeavor to collect from undoubted Sources such other information relative to this subject as may be acceptable.

Altho' for 4 or 5 years past I had a perfect conviction that the intrigues of the Spaniards with the Western Country were not for the time dangerous, on account of the incapacity of the Governors of this Province and their want of pecuniary means, yet fearful of what might happen in future should more enlightened and ambitious Chiefs preside over it, I could not last year resist the temptation of hinting my suspicions of what had been formerly done in this way, to the President, at an interview with which he honor'd me and I even went so far as to assert that a Person supposed to be an Agent from the State of Kentucky<sup>5</sup> had been here in the end of 1795 and beginning of 1796 to negotiate on the part of that State independent of the general Government for the navigation of the Mississippi, before the result of the Treaty of Sn. Lorenzo was known, wishing that this hint might induce the President to cause enquiry to be made into the Circumstance, which he could easily find the means of investigating but as he made no other enquiry of me respecting it than merely in what year the thing happened, it then struck me that he must have had other information on the subject and that he thought it needless to hear any thing more about it. By great accident I have lately learned

of a letter of Daniel Clarke to the Sec'y of State dated New Orleans Mar. 8, 1803", and is printed, with that heading, in *Am. St. Pap., Misc.*, I. 713, and in *Annals of Congress*, 10 Cong., 1 sess., II. 2744-2745. See also the evidence of John Graham in *Clark's Proofs*, p. 101.

<sup>3</sup> San Fernando de Barrancas (Écores à Margot), at present Memphis; fort established there in 1793. See Houck, *Spanish Régime in Missouri*, II. 114-118.

<sup>4</sup> Ugulayacabé, a Chickasaw chief. The next sentence was omitted by Jefferson when laying these extracts before Congress.

<sup>5</sup> Benjamin Sebastian is no doubt meant.

something which induces me to suppose that any information he may have received respecting the measure alluded to, has been incorrect and given with the view of misleading him, and I request you will mention the subject anew to him, that you may know how far I am right in my suspicions. The information I possessed on the subject, could not from the way in which it was obtained be accompanied with what would be Proof to convict the Person concerned, or I should have openly accused him in the face of the World, but to me it amounted to a moral certainty of his Guilt, and my Conduct to him showed on all occasions how much I detested his Object this Person.<sup>6</sup> The same want of Proof positive sufficient to convict him, prevents me at present from naming him; but if enquiry is diligently made, about the influential Character from Kentucky who at that Period was so long in Natchez and afterwards here, what his Business was, and what was the idea entertained of him, enough will doubtless be discovered to put our Government on its guard against him and others of his Stamp and against all foreign machinations in that Quarter in future.]

I have been interrupted at this Period of my letter by a long Visit from the Monsr. Roustan who accompanied me from Europe, whom in my advices from London I mentioned to you as the confidential Agent of the French Capt. General Victor, who is shortly expected to take possession of Louisiana; this man is not only high in his Confidence but is likewise so in that of the Commissaire de Justice Jean Job Aymé, and from what he voluntarily communicated on the passage and by means of that information what I extracted from him, it appears that they will under various pretences and by means of Jobs and favors plunder the Country in conjunction and divide the Spoil among them. He spoke at large of the Views of the French and did not hesitate to say that unless the General had orders to the contrary from the Consul of France, that he would maintain things in their present State, and would keep us excluded from the deposit, he mentioned likewise their Views of excluding our Shipping altogether from the Mississippi and the probability that by opening the markets of the French Islands to the produce of our upper Settlements exported in French Bottoms from the Mississippi, and granting them other privileges from which the Inhabitants of the Atlantic States should be excluded that they would detach the Western States from the Union, and altho' this man who is [in] many respects a man of sound sense and information, knew me to be an officer of the U. S. and must on reflection be persuaded that I would communicate these ideas to my Government, yet the Vanity so peculiar to his nation and the idea of their power and our Weakness so far predominated, as to make him boast of intentions, which sound Policy should induce him and all the rest of his faithless Countrymen to deny, till their Projects were ripe and they were sure of their execution. You will I flatter myself readily make allowance for the bitterness with which I speak of these People and their Views when you recollect how much Pain their insolence and contemptuous language respecting us and our Government must occasion.

I now inclose you the arrete of Bonaparte respecting the formation of a Government for this Country<sup>7</sup> which virtually places the whole authority in the Hands of the Capt. General.

<sup>6</sup> Apparently the writer meant to delete "his object" but did not.

<sup>7</sup> Given in substance in Martin, *History of Louisiana*, II. 182, and in Gayarré, III. 577.



*Despatches from U. S. Consulate in New Orleans* 335

A small Vessel arrived here yesterday in 21 days from Baltimore with dispatches addressed to the Intendant, the Capt. General, Colonial Prefect or French Commissaries who might be in this Country, but their contents have not transpired, it is supposed they were from Monsr. Pichon<sup>8</sup> and were forwarded by the Schooner Cordelia.

You will see the necessity of keeping these advices to yourself or communicating their Contents only to the President in case you deem them worthy of his notice, on account of my personal safety, as not being recognized by the Government in the Capacity of Consul, they might not hesitate to destroy me and confiscate my Property—should it be necessary to make any part of them public, be pleased to give me timely information that I may depart from hence and if possible withdraw my own Property and that of the Friends entrusted to me. I have the Honor to remain with respect and Esteem Sir

Your very humble  
and most obedient Servt.

DANIEL CLARK

P. S. I anxiously wish to hear from you in reply to my Communications.

V. CLARK TO MADISON.

NEW ORLEANS 27 April 1803

Copy

Sir

Since my last the most remarkable Circumstance that has occurred is the arrival of the Prefect and his Family,<sup>9</sup> accompanied by the Adjutant General and an Engineer who are all busily employed in making preparations to receive the Capt. General and the Troops who are hourly looked for. A national Brig has also arrived from Dunkirk with military Stores, another that sailed with her was lost on the Coast of England.

The Proclamation issued by the Prefect the very Evening of his arrival,<sup>10</sup> has I know been forwarded to the Executive, or on my return

<sup>8</sup> Louis André Pichon, chargé d'affaires for France in Washington 1801–1805. Laussat writes to Decrès, Apr. 18, 1803: "As soon as I had entered the Mississippi [he arrived in New Orleans Mar. 26], I received through the Spanish intendant, Morales, a packet of despatches from the commissioner general Pichon, chargé d'affaires for the French Republic to the United States, dated 20 Pluviôse last [Feb. 9], of which the superscription was to the captain-general [Victor] or to me." Robertson, *Louisiana under the Rule of Spain, France, and the United States*, II. 30. The letter of 20 Pluviôse, now in the Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Paris, recommends to the prefect the American claims respecting the navigation of the Mississippi and the policy of maintaining the privilege of deposit at New Orleans.

<sup>9</sup> Laussat arrived Mar. 26, 1803, with "a young and beautiful family", says an eye-witness in Barbé-Marbois, *Histoire de la Louisiane et de la Cession*, p. 226. A wife and three daughters are mentioned by Laussat in his rare *Mémoires*, quoted by Villiers du Terrage, *Les Dernières Années de la Louisiane Française*, p. 396. The adjutant general was Burthe, the engineer Vinache. They quarrelled. A pamphlet, *Vinache en Réponse à Burthe*, is in A. G. I., Pap. proc. de Cuba, leg. 2368.

<sup>10</sup> Facsimile of the printed broadside in Villiers du Terrage, *Les Dernières Années*, p. 403; its substance is given in English in Martin, *History of Louisiana*, II. 187, and in Gayarré, III. 586.

from Natchez <sup>11</sup> I should have immediately transmitted a Copy—its effect has been but trifling tho' all were eager to see and examine it; the allusion to Count O'Reilly's Conduct which was approved by Spain,<sup>12</sup> has disgusted the Spaniards, and the very Creoles who had almost forgot the transaction blame the mention of it. I had last year jestingly anticipated this part of it and the ridicule then cast on it has had more weight than I expected. The Inhabitants of this Country ignorant as they are and unaccustomed to be addressed in this way, have sense enough to perceive there is no specific promise made them, and seem more than usually suspicious and fearful that far from being benefitted they will be great losers by returning to the bosom of the mother Country. They had been led to expect an exemption from taxes and that they would have at least a share in the Government and the formation of the laws, but in this latter they see by the Consul's arreté they are totally disappointed, and the Prefect's manner of acting, while void of Authority during the existence of the Spanish Government, far from realising their Utopian dreams of happiness, shows them that requisitions will take place of exemptions and that if necessary they will be enforced by the Bayonet when he can command it. On landing, he found contrary to his expectations there were no Barracks to lodge his Troops, the only one there is being occupied by the Regiment of Louisiana which cannot be immediately turned out, no Provisions ready, no Hospital Stores, and no willingness on the part of Government or Individuals to provide them and thereby lessen his trouble and anxiety; he began by making a great many demands of assistance from the Government which were but partially complied with. They gave him up the Customhouse to serve as a Barrack, and out of the City funds agreed to provide 130 Beds in addition to thirty already in the Hospital of Charity, to accommodate the Sick in the Fleet on its arrival, and made him a small advance to enable him to repair and despatch the National Brig which brought him out; a request (by the Government at his instance) accompanied with a hint that compulsion would be used if necessary, was made to the Planters, to furnish Rice Straw and Slabs from the Saw Mills, which the Proprietors to their great Expenditure are forced to bring at this inconvenient Season and deliver in Town gratis, and a Rope Walk of mine within the precincts of the City has been put in Requisition and part of the Works taken down, whereby all Labor is suspended, tho' they know the Workmens Wages to the amount of \$240 a Month must be paid. I have not for two years past appeared as Owner of this establishment, therefore content myself with remarking on their sacred regard to private Property, which produces an amazing effect. Many similar demands of private Property for the use of the Republic founded on its urgent wants were made to the Governor,

<sup>11</sup> In the volume from which these despatches are taken there is one written by Clark from Natchez, March 24, and four from vice-consul Hulings to Madison during the consul's absence, March 29, 30, April 1, 12. In that of April 1 Hulings reports an interview with Laussat in which the prefect said that it was not the policy of European governments to admit consuls in their colonies, intimating that he would do as the Spanish governors had done in that respect. In the despatch of April 12 Hulings says that a vessel from Bordeaux reports that Victor's expedition is going to Santo Domingo, not to Louisiana.

<sup>12</sup> Referring to the severity with which the Spanish governor Don Alejandro O'Reilly punished the insurrection of 1768. For the king's approval, see Gayarré, III. 38.

and among them one in particular to put at the Prefects disposal a considerable Quantity of Timber, Planks, etc. belonging to various Individuals which then lay dispersed along the Front of the City, was refused at the instigation of the Secretary who gave for answer to the proposal, that private Property was sacred with the Spanish Government, but that he the Prefect could purchase it, or propose arrangements to the owners who would doubtless be glad to deal with him. This did not suit, he wished to get without an equivalent and repeated the urgent necessity of the Republic which could not buy altho' he has near 150,000 dollars in the Treasury landed from the Vessel he came in, which he alleges are a sacred deposit, not to be made use of until the arrival of General Victor, and all the Contracts he has hitherto proposed, for supplies to be delivered when wanted, are accompanied with the Condition of paying  $\frac{1}{3}$  in Cash and the remainder in 6 Months. By this mode of proceeding he has excited suspicion and distrust, and a total unwillingness to deal with him so generally prevails, that except in a few instances he has entirely failed, and where he has made a contract it has been at Prices far exceeding former rates. for instance Beef will be furnished at 8 Cents p lb instead of 4, and the privilege of selling fresh Beef is exclusively granted to the Contractor, Wood at  $\$3\frac{1}{2}$  p Chord instead of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  and so in proportion for other articles. He advertised repeatedly that he was willing to receive proposals for Flour but none were made unless for Cash which was not accepted. The Conduct of the Workmen has sorely mortified him, and his has as much disgusted them, he called them together at the Town house to propose a Contract for 1500 Camp Bedsteads and began by premising that he would hear no proposal exceeding 4 dollars—they answered that it could not be done under 6, and were informed the thing was inadmissible, upon which they went off in a body. He supposed they had retired merely to confer among themselves, and could not conceal his disappointment and vexation, when on ordering them to be readmitted, he found they had all gone about their Business, he complained of being treated with neglect and insult, and threatened if they did not accept his terms to put them in requisition at a dollar p Day, this was soon carried to them and excited a commotion which you can easily imagine among men accustomed to earn from  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to 5\$ a day at their respective Trades, and he was imprudent enough to confirm the report next day, when waited on by one of the number, whom he menaced for his Conduct, and who replied that this Language did not at all coincide with that of his Proclamation. However insinuating and captivating are the manners of the Prefect generally, he cannot always sufficiently command himself, and the tone of authority at times assumed, disgusts the rich and frightens the Poor, and every advantage has and will be taken of every accidental Circumstance to heighten these unfavorable impressions, which cause a longing Eye to be turned to our Government in hopes of relief from it. Vanity and presumption are I believe leading traits in the Prefect's Character, and they will betray him into many foolish Measures; he came out with notions of this Country founded on old Histories and false reports, all his Calculations of expences are erroneous, he finds opposition where he relied on assistance and the consequence I hope will be that he will get exasperated and render matters worse by precipitation and an obstinate attachment to first Views and ideas. He has imprudently expressed himself contemptuously of the Capt General's understanding and regretted that he had permitted him-

self to be advised by 2 or 3 Counsellors who would mar his (Laussat's) projects, without which he would lead him by the nose. These Counsellors are, the Commissaire de Justice, Aymé, and the Monsr Roustan who accompanied me from Europe to whom I have communicated the Prefects opinion of the Capt General and himself, and fortunately the Prefect by not inviting him to a public Dinner, has confirmed his bad opinion of him. In hopes of deriving advantage from their mutual hatred I shall endeavor to foster it; it will prevent all concert in public Measures, the People will be worse governed by their eternally thwarting each other, and will be less inclined to oppose us, should Circumstances at a future Day call for active measures. The Prefect's Language with respect to the U. S. is soft and conciliatory, is a perfect contrast to what he made use of in Europe; but he now perceives his weakness and means to try the effect of flattery and cajoling, he is pointed in his enquiries in every thing that regards us, and says there will be no other than a Rivality in Commerce between us, yet while he talks of amity and good offices, he advises the Governor to make no change with respect to the deposit, but to wait for Orders from Europe—for the truth of this assertion I stake my Veracity,—he seems to have little idea of our Constitution or Government and was egregiously deceived in his ideas of the Population of our Western Country which he estimated at but 200,000 Souls,<sup>13</sup> and in making enquiry of a particular Friend of mine respecting our Troops on the Mississippi and the Commander in Chief, he asked in whose pay he was, meaning in the pay of what State. He received me with politeness as he did also the Vice Consul, whom he invited in my absence to his public Dinner, and puffed him in the account he published of it, and pays a marked attention to all the Americans, whom he visited, whether they called on him or not, and endeavors to impress them with the most favorable Sentiments of his Government, and of the advantages to be derived from their neighbourhood but I believe he has hitherto met with little Success. He put me in mind of our Conversation at Paris and laughingly told me I had fled before him, he enquired about my Fortune and advised me to divide my negroes and put one half of them on the French territory, said that I had done wrong to break up my Commercial Establishment and hoped I would not retire into the Country, that the Province was in want of men of Capital who would find their Interest in residing in it, and that his orders and inclinations equally concurred in offering them Protection and commercial advantages. As there were many Americans present I thought the opportunity would be a good one to undeceive them, by reminding him that I had pointedly asked him in Paris how far we might count on his Protection and whether we should be allowed to continue to trade in Orleans in the same way as we had been permitted by the Spanish Government, or whether we must retire with our Capitals and let other Countries profit by our Industry, to which he had then given me to understand we must and that I had in consequence returned from Europe without engaging in any new commercial Project. I pretended to be pleased at hearing that he had now other Views and some of the Company pressed him for an explanation which somewhat disconcerted him and produced the effect I desired by showing he was insincere and that we had nothing to expect from him when his own ends were answered, but I shall strenuously endeavor to

<sup>13</sup> The census of 1800 had reported the population of the states and territories west of the mountains as 386,000.

make him believe I have become the dupe of his Professions and if you wish me to carry matters further will strive to impress him with the idea that I may be made a Convert to his Views and useful to his Government. On this head, as well as to what particular points I should in future turn my attention, please to give me some directions, that my time and my exertions may be advantageously employed in my Country's Service.

I have written to Govr. Claiborne on the affairs of the Tombicbee Country and the Mission of Monsr de Villiers among the Indians and inclose you a Copy of my Letter for your Government.<sup>14</sup> To his answer I shall conform till I hear from you. Many endeavors are making to attract the Indians from all Quarters and I respectfully advise the necessity of counteracting the effect of their Presents and intrigues with such fickle and dangerous neighbours. Whatever further intelligence I obtain of their measures I shall immediately communicate to you.

The Prefect has already mentioned that a Consul will not be recognised here by the French Government—this will be very injurious to our Commerce, as independent of every other disadvantage there will be no Agent of the Government to assist the distressed, prevent or remonstrate against abuses which from the distance of our Government would have time to take root before the injured individuals who suffered by them could lay their Complaints before the Executive in hopes of obtaining redress. It has occurred to me that if the French Government should refuse to acknowledge a Consul or Commercial Agent on shore at New Orleans as being in their dominions, yet as an Officer of the U. S. if his Acts were signed and dated on board an American Ship in the Stream of the Mississippi which is common to both nations, they ought to be as much attended to as those of any other Officer within the territory of the U. S. and I wish to have your Opinion whether I should attempt it. I am not fond of making an Experiment on the Strength of my own Judgment whereby I should in the least commit the honor of the Country, but if the President thinks the Measure ought to be resorted to and would countenance me I will not shrink from any personal danger in making a trial and bearing the Consequences of persisting in it.

Doctor Watkins<sup>15</sup> whom I have already mentioned to you as a Land Speculator is proposing Plans to the French Government for colonizing a part of the upper Country, the Tract included between the Rivers St. Francis and Arkansas. I am sore all over when I perceive any thing

<sup>14</sup> Clark to Claiborne, April 22 (extract): "A person of the name of Chevalier de Villiers who has spent almost his whole life amongst the Indian Nations, but who for a few years past has retired to the Atacapas on the west of the Mississippi, has been lately summoned to Town and is now here preparing for a mission. I will learn to what particular nation and on what errand and will advise you. I suspect it to be to the Creeks. He is an old man smart and Active, sun burnt, wrinkled and wizened face, stoops a little, middle size and grey headed and in this Country wears a militia uniform having I believe the rank of Captain, this mission can forebode us no good and he is a dangerous man among the Indians." The intendant Morales had ordered the commandant at Mobile to enforce strictly his order of the preceding October cutting off all communication between New Orleans and the American settlements on the Tombigbee.

<sup>15</sup> Dr. John Watkins, afterward president of the Mexican Association and mayor of New Orleans.

like a communication on the point of being established between the Prefect and our Western Settlements and I fear the effect of his offers of Land and commercial advantages on People possessed of little Property and indifferent about their Country or at least indifferent about the effect French measures may produce on the Union provided they derive a temporary benefit from them. In speaking thus freely on so delicate a subject I fear I shall have few on your side the Mountains think with me, that we have reason to apprehend the effect of French intrigue on the People of Kentucky, and this I am persuaded is because but few will be thought base enough to enter into the Views of a foreign Government, but were you to have the Opportunities which daily offer here of attending to their Conversations and Views, you would soon agree that no dependence ought to be placed on a majority of them, if even very slight advantages were held out, or that they could be made to believe they would find their Interest in seceding from the General Government, a measure which will be the foremost in the mind of every Frenchman in Office in this Country.

The Prefect is carrying his enquiries into our individual Opinions so far as to wish to know which of us is a federalist and which a Republican, a thing which I believe it would be a difficult matter for most of us to determine with respect to ourselves, as party Spirit evaporates in foreign Countries where no End can be attained by it and I flatter myself the respectable part of us who are settled here will always be found to be Americans eager and desirous of serving our Country, without meddling in the Quarrels which distract it. I shall shortly learn the Prefects motives for making this enquiry and he shall be led to believe we are all Federalists or all Republicans as may best answer our purpose and lead him into Error.

You will find inclosed Copies of a few addresses to him in answer to his Proclamation, one from the Merchants and residents of the City<sup>16</sup> and one from each of the two Parishes next adjoining to it which extend along the River about 15 Leagues above the Town. The other Parishes or Posts will doubtless follow the example as soon as they can find some Priest or Schoolmaster to pen one for them, but they ridicule the measure and say they do it from necessity. This is the general Sentiment even to the lowest class among them.

A Report has just got in circulation which I know to be unfounded of new disturbances having arisen in France which endanger the consular authority, it has given me an Opportunity of learning the disposition even of some of the newly arrived officers who did not hesitate to declare that were it true, the Colony should think of its own safety and declare itself independent—when reminded of the impossibility of defending itself alone they replied that we had only to unite with the American Confederacy. As many of the Officers now coming out are supposed to be

<sup>16</sup> "Trente quatre ans d'une domination étrangère n'ont point affaibli dans nos coeurs l'amour sacré de la Patrie", etc.; annotated, "Written by the Interpreter Mr. Derbigny". There is an English version in Gayarré, III. 589. Baron Villiers du Terrage prints this and one of the others, from the Côte des Allemands, in *Dernières Années*, pp. 404-406. Clark's copy from the parish of St. Charles bears the annotation, "By the Parish Priest, signed by him, the Commandant and Church Wardens"; that from the parish of St. Jean Baptiste, "By a Pedant of the name of Trouard, who does not believe a syllable of it".



*Despatches from U. S. Consulate in New Orleans* 341

Republicans in principle and detest the regal State of the French Government I would not be surprised at the prevalence of such ideas very generally among them.

I am more confirmed every day in my Opinion from observation of what passes, that the measure of shutting up the deposit has been done by concert between France and Spain and in compliance with orders forwarded by the latter to the Intendant of this City. The Minister of Finance writes to him on the 9th January of this year, that he has received his despatches of July and August, his secret dispatch of September and *No. 1 his very secret dispatch* of 21st October (which must have been his advice of the measures taken.)<sup>17</sup> This extraordinary coincidence of a new series of numbers, the expression of *very secret* with the time of excluding us from the deposit and the Silence of the Minister on an object of so much importance, as he does not write in answer, show that the thing was expected, and was received as a matter of course. It may be proper for you to bear in mind the period when you know these despatches reached the Court of Spain and compare the date of the Ministers Letters with what Yruj6 and Pichon will afterwards undertake to say to you on the subject.

In my letter of the 22nd June of last Year<sup>18</sup> I informed you that a duty of 3 p Cent had been exacted on all Monies entered for deposit and Shipment in New Orleans and that the Intendant had consulted his Catholic Majesty respecting it. An answer has been received in which the King approves of the exaction of the duty and orders the amount of it which is \$749 to be equally divided between the Intendant, Treasurer and Contractor (or Comptroller) in recompense for Storage, responsibility and Trouble, as you will perceive by a certified Copy and translation of the Ministers Letter dated at Aranjuez 13 January of this Year, now inclosed—from this you may judge of the sacred regard paid to the Treaty with us by the Court of Spain which can no longer call this an unauthorised act of the Intendant.

The Marquis de Casa Yruj6<sup>19</sup> writing to the Intendant on the 11th March makes use of nearly this Language "I am a Minister of the Crown as well as yourself and have often avoided doing what I was ordered, when it would have been imprudent to do it on account of circumstances—the Court from its immense distance has taken up a wrong idea, therefore suspend the execution of its orders if you have received them 'till you hear further from it."

Why does the Marquis write in this Strain if, as he has said to you in his Letter of the 10th<sup>20</sup> which I see published, he has full conviction that Morales acted without orders.

The Capt General of the Havana who on the receipt of the first despatches would not meddle in the discussion, but contented himself with barely giving advice of the measure to Court, now presses the Intendant very much, to withdraw his opposition being fearful of the Consequences, and if not supported by positive Orders from Court I am persuaded from my knowledge of his Character, that the Intendant would shrink into annihilation at the Prospect before him.

<sup>17</sup> Morales to Cayetano Soler, minister of finance, Oct. 21, 1802, "no. 1 muy reservada", is in the Archives of the Indies, Pap. proc. Cuba, legs. 594 and 595.

<sup>18</sup> No. III., *supra*, vol. XXXII., pp. 822-824.

<sup>19</sup> Spanish minister to the United States.

<sup>20</sup> Meaning, March 10; published in a newspaper, after Yruj6's manner.



Confidential Letters from Havana of a very recent date, the 20th Inst. mention that the Marquis de Casa Calvo is expected to sail immediately to take the Command of this Province and deliver it to the French <sup>21</sup>— if it should then be necessary he is to remain here to command the Spanish Troops and act under the orders of the French Governor, and his own Regiment, the *fixed Regiment of the Havana* is to join him on the first requisition. Orders have been received from the Marquis to take a House for him for 12 Months, which confirm in some measure this intelligence.

I waited on the Intendant this Morning and introduced Mr Vertner the Contractor for the Army who was desirous of obtaining his permission to make a Shipment of Provisions for the use of the U. S. Troops on the Tombigbee, which he immediately granted and I shall see that it is made with all possible expedition.

The Prefect has this day written to the Governor and inclosed to him a Statement of the Officers coming out in the Fleet from Holland, that accommodations might be prepared for them. As I think it right you should be acquainted with their number, rank, and employment, I inclose you a Copy of it which I took myself from the original and I fancy you will be surprised at the magnitude of the List and wonder how they are to be supported.<sup>22</sup> I like wise forward you a Copy and translation of the Royal Order for the surrender of this Country with the Letter from the Minister of the Department of State to the minister of Finance on the subject, and am happy to perceive in it that Spain seems to have remembered that she had disposed of what was once a part of French Louisiana, or acknowledged in us a better right to it, this part of the Royal order I have underlined as the most remarkable.<sup>23</sup>

I am fearful that these details which I am at a great deal of trouble and Expence to procure may appear trifling to you and not worthy of much attention; they are all however that in my limited sphere I can attempt, and I have been induced to trouble you with them, merely in case Negotiation should fail you might be acquainted with our local Views, measures and Characters of those in command among us, to be governed by them in future operations. Should you think them sufficiently interesting to desire a continuation of them or direct my attention to other Views I shall take pleasure in executing or at least attempting any thing you may command, and have the Honor to remain with respect and Esteem

Sir

Your most obedient  
and most humble Servant

DANIEL CLARK

<sup>21</sup> Salcedo was still governor.

<sup>22</sup> The list embraces 250 officers; the population of the province was about 50,000 whites.

<sup>23</sup> The essence of the order (Barcelona, Oct. 15, 1802, printed in French in Villiers du Terrage, *Dernières Années*, p. 424), and the passage underlined in the enclosed copy certified by Clark, may be seen in the following extract: . . . "le pongais en posesion de la Colonia de la Luisiana y sus Dependencias igualmente que de la Ciudad é Isla de la Na. Orleans, con la misma extension que tiene actualmente, que tenia en poder de la Francia quando la cedió a mi Rl. Corona, y tal qual debe ser ó hallarse despues de los tratados sucesivamente ocurridos entre mis Estados y los de otras Potencias." The words are quoted from the treaty of San Ildefonso.

*Despatches from U. S. Consulate in New Orleans 343*

P. S. You know how necessary it will be to guard these Papers and keep my name and the means by which they reached you from the knowledge of those who might have it in their power to injure me or those from whom I recd them which it would be easy to trace if enquiry was set on foot here. I therefore implicitly rely on your Care and Prudence. Should Circumstances call for a disclosure of the contents of any of them, a hint that they were recd from Madrid might lull Suspicion. to prevent accident would it not be well to furnish me with a Cypher in case you judge proper to call for any further Communications—  
The Honble James Madison

VI. CLARK TO MADISON.

NEW ORLEANS 13 May 1803

(duplicate)

*Sir*

The Marquis de Casa Calvo who is one of the Commissioners named for delivering up this Colony to the French arrived here the 10th Inst. I have learned from him that Spain does not intend putting France in possession of any thing East of the Mississippi but the Island of Orleans, so that the Strip of Territory included between the Iberville and the 31 Degree of Latitude will be for the present a barrier between our States and France. The Prefect has not yet the least idea of this, as he as well as the Capt General imagine that they are to take possession on the latter's arrival of all the Country as far Eastward as the River Perdido, and every where between it and the Boundary line of the U. S. This will infallibly cause some trouble and confusion as I fear the French will be for taking immediate possession by Force, if their wishes cannot be otherwise accomplished. The Marquis has not Strength enough to oppose them efficaciously however inclined to do it. Should this Point contrary to my Expectations be settled amicably another still more difficult will remain viz, to settle the Boundary of the Province in its whole Length to the Westward, which has never yet been defined. Should any difficulties occur between the Parties, could any advantage be taken of them for ourselves? I am promised a sight of the Royal Orders and secret Instructions to the Commissioners, the contents of which I shall advise you of. After the delivery of New Orleans the Marquis de Casa Calvo is to determine in conjunction with the French Commissioner every thing respecting Limits, a Work which neither he or any body else can ever hope to see brought to Conclusion. I have the Honor to remain

Sir

Your most obedient  
and most humble Servant

DANIEL CLARK

The Honble James Madison

VII. CLARK TO MADISON.<sup>24</sup>

*Sir*

I have this morning seen the Papers mentioned in my Letter of yesterday, they are positive not to deliver anything more to France than what

<sup>24</sup> Endorsed as received June 18.

was possessed by Spain East of the Mississippi, when Great Britain possessed West Florida, it not being as the Minister expresses himself, his Majesties intention to surrender to the French any Country that was not received of them, and by all means to keep all Conquests made from the Enemy, all ceded territory, and all new discoveries which might have been included by Spain within the bounds of Louisiana since the Cession from France to her. These orders have been forwarded in reply to an official demand of the Governor of this Country dated 11 November last, in which he requested an explanation of many Points that appeared doubtful to him, and the Ministers reply is dated the 18th January of this year forwarded by an extra advice Boat to Havana. The Courier who was the bearer of the Ministers Letters to the Sea Port had orders to remain there till he saw the Vessel by which they went under sail, and she was towed out of the Harbour against the Wind. Altho' this would show great anxiety on the part of Ministers respecting Louisiana, it is surprising there is not a Word respecting the Deposit, or any thing relating to us. They wait until they hear what effect this Measure has produced in the U. S. to regulate their proceedings and avow the Conduct of the Intendant or not as may best suit their purposes. I have the Honor to remain  
Sir

Your most obedient  
and most humble Servant

DANIEL CLARK

New Orleans 14 May 1803  
The Honble. James Madison.

#### VIII. CLARK TO MADISON.

NEW ORLEANS 17th May 1803

Sir

I had the Honor of receiving this morning at 11 O'clock by an express from Governor Claiborne of the Mississippi Territory your letter of the 19th Ultio, accompanying the orders for the immediate restoration of the Deposit, addressed to the Governor and Intendant of this province<sup>25</sup> which were instantly delivered, and such immediate attention was paid to them, that at two in the afternoon various Copies of the inclosed paper were affixed by the Intendants orders in the most public parts of the City, announcing that the deposit was placed on its former footing, and his orders of the 16th October revoked. The Governor will publish the restoration of the deposit to morrow by Proclamation with the usual Ceremonies.

I have the Honor to remain with respect  
Sir  
Your most obedient  
and most humble Servant

DANIEL CLARK

Honble James Madison

<sup>25</sup> Madison to Livingston and Monroe, Apr. 20, 1803: "The letter from the Marquis d'Yrujo, of which you will find a translated copy in the enclosed newspaper of this date, was yesterday received. The letters to which it refers, as containing orders for the re-establishment of our deposite at New Orleans, were immediately forwarded." *Am. St. Pap., For. Rel.*, II. 556. The king's order was dated March 1.

*Despatches from U. S. Consulate in New Orleans* 345

IX. CLARK TO MADISON.<sup>26</sup>

NEW ORLEANS 21 July 1803.

(Private)

*Sir*

I inclose you a Copy of a Letter I have just had an Opportunity of forwarding to our Consul General in Paris,<sup>27</sup> and accompanied it with some notes chiefly respecting the Population, Commerce and Boundaries of this Country thinking that they might be of some use in the Present Circumstances. It is generally supposed here that the War between England and France must put an end to all idea of the latter getting possession of the Colony, and that the Prefect and other French officers must shortly return home. Their Stay here will only be productive of Jealousy on the part of the Spaniards and perhaps mischief, as attempts are daily making on the one hand to usurp authority, which are almost always vigorously repressed on the other. It is a fortunate Circumstance for us that Monsr. Laussat will not be invested with authority, as all his Actions and Views are directed to our prejudice. He violently opposed the restoration of the deposit even after the Royal Order had been received, and made attempts to succeed in this matter with the Marquis de Casa Calvo and Intendant separately, complained bitterly that the order was so *tranchant*, and when I waited on him with a Letter from the French Minister<sup>28</sup> advising of what was to be done, he lost his temper and betrayed the emotions and Sentiments which then prevailed within him. He had proposed a variety of vexatious regulations respecting Searches and Visits of our Shipping, says we ought not to be looked as a Corps de Nation, but as a number of Hordes spread over the Country and to his Friends has expressed his regret that he has not a small Force to give Law to us. Whether these were his own or the views of his Government we should not have the less to suffer from them. To avoid tiring you with details I refrain from saying any thing more on the subject.

The Marquis de Casa Calvo who has no Love for the French Government or French measures, had it in contemplation in case of the surrender of the Colony to draw off from the Island of New Orleans and Western Bank of the Mississippi the whole of the Inhabitants of 3 or 4 Posts or Settlements and place them in the Lands reserved by the Spaniards between the Iberville and our Boundary Line. I have strongly advocated the measure, as it will augment their mutual Jealousy and hatred, will weaken the French and will be of service to ourselves by increasing the Produce of a populous tract of Country already in a thriving Situation whose whole Commerce will be ours, as Spain in order to strengthen their attachment will make no attempt to raise a Revenue there, or prevent a Trade with those who may be of most Service to them.

<sup>26</sup> Endorsed as received August 22.

<sup>27</sup> Fulwar Skipwith, "commercial agent of the United States", the title given to our consul general in Paris during the period of the Consulate.

<sup>28</sup> Meaning Pichon, chargé d'affaires at Washington.

A Second Vessel, the *Citoyen*, loaded with Stores for acct. of the French Government arrived a short time since—she sailed from Rochfort early in March.

I have the Honor to remain with Respect  
Sir

Your most obedient  
and most humble Servant

DANIEL CLARK

The Honble James Madison

X. CLARK TO MADISON.

NEW ORLEANS 12 August 1803

*Sir*

I have been honored with your Letter of the 6th ulto.<sup>29</sup> and feel the sincerest joy on the accomplishment of an object so dear to the Heart of every American. This important Cession will insure the safety and Prosperity of our Western Country and I request you will accept my sincere Congratulations on so great an Event. I am now preparing in addition to the remarks lately forwarded you respecting Boundaries etc. a Map of the Western part of the Country with notes on the Settlements and Discoveries of the French in that Quarter which I shall take the earliest opportunity of forwarding you and presuming there may be other points on which you may desire information I beg you will point them out and such as can be procured here will be transmitted without delay. The news of the Cession gives general Satisfaction to the Planters and Spaniards (even in Office) and is disliked by a few of the merchants and lower Classes of the Towns People only, on whom the Prefect has been practising every Art to convince them of the impossibility of such an Event taking Place and this measure crowns his disgrace by showing his admirers that the very circumstance which he reprobates so much in his Proclamation (*viz* the Sale of the Province) has again taken place under the Man whose first thoughts they were led to suppose were occupied with Plans for their Happiness. The name of Bonaparte will now become odious on the Banks of the Mississippi. I sincerely wish that Possession may soon be taken and all our expectation realised.

I have the Honor to remain Sir

Your most obedient  
and most humble Servt.

DANIEL CLARK

The Honble James Madison

XI. CLARK TO MADISON.

NEW ORLEANS 20 October 1803

*Sir*

I have this Evening had the Honor of receiving your Letter of the 16th ulto.

I have hitherto been fearful that the details and information in my power to convey from this Country would rather prove tiresome than acceptable and on that account have only risked troubling you with what I thought indispensable, I am happy to learn that these Communications

<sup>29</sup> Notifying Clark of the signing of the Louisiana treaty of Apr. 30, 1803.

*Despatches from U. S. Consulate in New Orleans* 347

will not be taken amiss and it will always afford me pleasure to prove my desire of being useful.

Whatever may have hitherto been the intentions of the Prefect, and these must have been regulated by the secret instructions received from his Court, the unexpected Cession of this Country to the U. S. and the political Situation of France have now rendered a change of measures necessary, and that decided enmity to the Individuals and Government of the U. S. which was so strongly marked in the Language and Actions of the Prefect has now given place to more pacific and friendly Views, and a more conciliatory Language and Conduct, and if I except a wish to gratify his Vanity by retaining possession of the Province a few days I believe he will place no obstacle whatever in the way of the delivery of it to the Commissioners appointed by the U. S. for that purpose. Much trouble arising from etiquette may be expected, but as I flatter myself the Persons appointed for so important a Commission will be Men of talents and Experience and possess a knowledge of the World, this will be easily got over and it will require from such People but little exertions to make every thing easy and acceptable in the outset and reconcile all Parties to our Government from which the greatest Benefits are confidently expected.

In saying that I am confident we shall experience but little difficulty from the Prefect in taking possession I count fully on a sincere disposition at present on the part of France to fulfill its stipulations with us and the most positive orders given to the Prefect to comply with them—from the Man himself we have every thing to apprehend if left to the suggestions of his own violent temper and inclinations. He has however completely lost the confidence of the People of Louisiana, and would find no effectual support whatever at this Period, in an attempt to elude or delay the delivery of the Country.

I have in my former Letters repeatedly mentioned the bad terms on which he stood with the officers of the Spanish Government, and their mutual Jealousies and mistrusts, which occasioned some time since an official Communication from the Governor that all Correspondence between them must cease, unless on points relating to his Mission. An incident has since occurred which has put an End even to exterior Civilities, and in future the Prefects residence here will be a continued Series of Mortifications to which his Pride and Insolence have justly exposed him.

Friday the 14th was the Birthday of the Prince of Asturias,<sup>30</sup> the Marquis de Casa Calvo as Commissioner for the surrender of the Province gave a splendid entertainment in honor of the day, to which all the first Characters and People in office were invited. Among them were the Prefect and his Suite, the Adjutant General of the French Troops and a Lt Col. of Engineers. The Vice Consul and myself were likewise invited. The Prefect on entering was received by the Marquis with the utmost Civility, was saluted by and returned the Civilities of the Guests, and being intreated by him to enter an inner apartment to free himself of his Hat and Sword and accompanied by the Marquis who conversed with him, he pretended then to notice for the first time the Adjutant General with whom he was on bad terms, and whom he had some time since attempted to have shipped off for France—'twas on this Occasion when his Wishes were not complied with, that he informed the Governor

<sup>30</sup> Eldest son of the King of Spain; afterward Ferdinand VII.



and Marquis, he had directed them to execute his Orders, not to discuss the propriety of the Measure or make opposition to it. After remarking the Adjut. General he seized his Hat which he had already laid down, said aloud, he could not stay where the other was and in spite of the expostulations of the Marquis who intreated him on account of the Day and the Guests that he would moderate his Passion and remain, he went away in a rage followed by his Suite to the astonishment of all present. It was immediately known that this Scene was premeditated, he knew of the Invitation to the Adjutant General, had seen his Carriage at the Marquis's gate and contrary to his usual Custom had given Orders to his own Coachman to wait his return. This insult was felt by the Marquis and would have been instantly punished in a personal Way had he not been restrained by his Friends—in his Anger he turned to the Governor <sup>81</sup> and told him, that in future he alone must transact Business with the Prefect as no Communication whatever should from thence forward take place between Mr. Laussatt and himself—this incident was resented by all present, and was so much felt as an insult that on the following Monday almost all the Guests who had been previously invited by the Prefect to an entertainment on that day, among whom were one of the Alcaldes and 8 officers of Rank in the Spanish Service absented themselves without sending Excuses, and he can expect nothing but a repetition of such mortifications on all succeeding occasions.

I have entered into this detail of a Business trifling in itself, to show you the Character and overbearing disposition of the Man, his unaccommodating temper and the consequences that result from it.

These animosities between the two authorities, French and Spanish, will prove favorable to us if the Persons appointed on our part to Offices here, know how to avail themselves of the Opportunity they present, there can be no Collusion, no Union between them to injure us, on the contrary each Party will endeavor to serve us at the Expence of the other, will mutually betray and lay open each others Plans, and will to show their detestation of each other vie in their friendly offices, but much will depend on the dispatch made on our part to take possession, while a Sense of mutual Injuries is fresh in their Breasts and before they can reflect on the magnitude of the Sacrifice made to us. Spain has hitherto as I have before communicated given her Officers no official intelligence of the Cession to the U. S., they are prepared to deliver the Country to France, and will attempt no opposition to us unless Orders to that effect of a very positive nature should be communicated, in which case, the smallest preparations on their part will disclose their designs and enable us to baffle instantly all their projects. they are besides so weak as to be under the necessity of making the Militia of Orleans do garrison duty, a thing never done but in cases of necessity, and on that Militia, or on any other Force they might attempt to oppose to us, there could be placed no reliance, as the People are too well acquainted with their own weakness, with our Strength, our ability to punish and the immense advantages they will derive from the expected Change, to give us any Opposition were they even in a Situation to do it with effect. So far from being disposed to injure us, you may be positively assured that if the Officers sent here to take possession are Men of Sense and address, that most of the Officers in the Spanish Service will resign their Commissions and remain in the Province, as will all the married Men and People of Property, who daily

<sup>81</sup> Salcedo.



flock to me to testify the Joy they feel on the present prospect of happiness. Although a few of the Merchants, Adventurers, and lower Class of the People are the only persons who have ever been much attached to the present Government of France, or who in the worst of Events would think of giving trouble, still I cannot help advising that as strong a force as is consistent with the Views of our Government be at first sent here. The People are unaccustomed to Freedom and on the change of Government may become licentious, they have always paid obedience to an armed Force not to the Law, and may look upon our Government as weak if not supported by military authority. These Precautions if taken may afterwards appear needless, but they will be the means of preventing difficulties which without them would have arisen and this force may shortly be otherwise disposed of when the necessity for its remaining will be no longer apparent, and when the People on the Frontiers in the Posts of Atacapas, Opelousas and Natchitoches who are nearly all French, who from their Situation have not the means of acquiring information, and are excessively ignorant, can be made to learn the Principles of a free Government and comprehend the advantages resulting from good Order. These are the only Places where the Prefects Emissaries had met with any success in persuading the lower Classes of the People that they would be benefitted by the arrival of the French among them, and it became necessary on the part of the Spanish Government to arrest and bring to the Capital the Commandant of Atacapa, and an Agent of his who were issuing Orders there in compliance with directions from the Prefect.

With respect to the military force in this Province and its disposal I refer you to the inclosed Memorandum from which you will perceive that it is in itself trifling, is dispersed over a vast extent of Country, and cannot easily be concentrated.<sup>32</sup> The Force of the Militia and the position of the different Settlements you are already in possession of, and it must be apparent that with a little exertion on the part of our Officers stationed in the Mississippi Territory, joined to the Militia of that Country and our numerous Partezans here, even before assistance could be sent from other Parts of the U. S., all Communication between the distant Settlements and the Capital could easily be cut off before they were aware of the Blow about to be struck and that our disposable Force in that Quarter, backed by threats of Vengeance on the part of the U. S. in case of opposition, would be sufficient even to put us in possession of New Orleans itself by a coup de main before effectual Measures could be taken for its defence.

On the whole I am fearful of very little trouble with respect to taking possession—the trouble I apprehend will be more likely to occur afterwards when all the Evils attendant on a Change of Government viz a new Language, new Officers, new Laws, new Courts, and new forms of Justice, etc. etc. are felt and before the blessings expected can be realised. In this last it must be expected that [not?] all will be enthusi-

<sup>32</sup> The memorandum referred to, dated Oct. 2, runs as follows: "Memorandum of the Military Force and Garrisons in Louisiana: Apalaches, 200 men; Pensacola, 350; Mobile, 60; New Orleans and Bayou St. Jean, 300; Plaquemines and Balize, 60; Baton Rouge, 40; Illinois, 100; Arkansas, 30; Concord opposite Natchez and Esperanza opposite Chicasaw Bluffs, 50. The above is as near as I could learn the present force here, I shall however procure correct returns and forward them shortly."

asts, and those who are not immediately gratified will be disgusted. Add to this the anarchy now existing, the necessity of an immediate organization, the diversity of nations of which we are composed, our jarring political Sentiments, our entire ignorance of political Liberty, the different Opinions of what would best suit us, the violence and impatience of the Creole Character, and you will conceive a part of the difficulties the Man will have to labor under, who will have the task of governing us imposed on him and the necessity that he should be a person of talents, experience and even Consequence at home, in order to inspire Confidence in his Measures. Under these impressions I respectfully suggest in compliance with the wishes contained in your Letter, that the Government of this Country may at first be made so lucrative as to make it desirable to persons of the first talents and Character in the U. S., that the Commissioner or Commissioners sent to take possession may be qualified with respect to talents, address and Fortune for the trust reposed in them and that the Form of Government granted to us be as energetic as the Constitution of the U. S. will permit, and as our local Circumstances and Character require.

I have constantly endeavored to possess the Spanish authorities with the idea (knowing how pleasing it was to them) that our Government might be induced to give the Western Side of the Mississippi for the Floridas, and in consequence of this their Jealousy has been lulled, it would however be necessary that the Commissioners should be perfectly instructed with respect to the extent of Country they should claim on that side, and how they were to act in case of any opposition to deliver up the Province, unless they accepted of certain Boundaries favorable to the Spanish Government—this is the only difficulty I apprehend on the part of Spain, and it is merely a conjecture on my part that such a difficulty could possibly occur which I wish we might be prepared for in case of the Event.

I take the Liberty of inclosing to you a lengthy and ill written Parody of the Prefects Proclamation now circulated here, it is the work of a French Planter and will give you an idea of their Sentiments and the horror and disgust which the Sale of themselves and the Province has inspired them with.

Be pleased to assure the President that I shall carefully watch and advise you of every symptom indicative of a hostile or unfriendly disposition towards us from any Quarter whatever and that I shall spare no pains or exertions to increase the attachment of the People of this Country to the Government of the U. S. I have the Honor to remain very respectfully Sir

Your most obedient Servt.

DANIEL CLARK

The Honble. James Madison

P. S. The delay of the Letter you allude to which had not reached you is occasioned by the irregularities in the Post Office Department. I have this day received Letters from Philadelphia with the Post Mark of the 12th August, and we are tired of complaining of the injuries we suffer in consequence. I am fearful that my Letters do not always reach you. The duplicate of a Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury came to hand open, and my Friends in the Atlantic States complain to me of the same irregularities. As the Post has arrived late and returns early in the Morning you will I hope impute to a want of time that I have not been able to be more correct in what I have been obliged to write in haste.

*Despatches from U. S. Consulate in New Orleans* 351

XII. CLARK TO GOVERNOR CLAIBORNE.

NEW ORLEANS 7 November 1803

Sir

Having recd. directions from the Secretary of State to be attentive to every Symptom which might show itself relative to the disposition of the Spanish Officers or others in this Country, and to give the earliest advice of any intended opposition or difficulty which might be put in the way of the Commissioners appointed to take possession of it, I feel it my duty to inform you that a Conversation held by the Marquis de Casa Calvo at his table Yesterday, induces me to think that he meditates delays which might be prejudicial to our Interests. These are new Ideas in his mind, as but a few days ago he manifested a desire of bringing matters as speedily as possible to a conclusion, and arose out of a belief that the Cession of the Province to us cannot be agreeable to Spain, as the Court of Madrid has never given its Officers any official intelligence of this Event. A Packet received two days ago from Spain by which advices were expected makes no mention whatever of the Cession, and I should not be surprised that the Marquis who is at times violent and obstinate tho' not endowed with great political knowledge should suffer himself to be governed by the advice of those arround him who are still more ignorant than him. I heard these Opinions of the Marquis echoed by the Col. of the City Militia<sup>33</sup> last Evening. He is the particular Friend of the Marquis, and merely respects what he has heard from him, not having information sufficient to judge for himself on such Subjects. There are no preparations making for resistance, but certainly none for the dispatch of Business, and an intended Expedition of the Marquis on a shooting Party to the Sea Coast to the Westward near Barataria seems to show, that he thinks he has time enough to spare at so critical a moment when he is well informed that preparations are making for the Troops of the U. S. to descend from Fort Adams,<sup>34</sup> and that public report says they are expected on or about the 25th Inst. The Opinion expressed by the Marquis was, that he did not think himself authorised to deliver up the Country 'till further intelligence was received from Court. He has been advised officially by the Prefect, that he had orders to receive and deliver it, and when this Communication was made to the Governor and him, he seemed desirous that the Prefect should immediately proceed in conjunction with the Spanish Commissioners to name Persons to make Inventories and appraise the Stores, Arms and Ammunition in the Magazines and the public Buildings conformable to the Orders recd. This the Prefect declined 'till the arrival of the American Commissioner and so matters remained without giving room for any suspicion of an intention to act otherwise 'till Yesterday. You must be too well apprised of the necessity of availing yourself of the Moment, to suffer any delay to take place and ought therefore to be prepared for any Event. The orders received by the Prefect, the political Situation of his Country, and the variance subsisting between him and the Officers of Government will insure his Cooperation and that of the Party attached to him in any measures that may be necessary for the American Commissioners to take, and I believe if matters came to a crisis, that few would be found mad or desperate enough to join in any serious opposition when convinced that France and

<sup>33</sup> Miguel Fortier.

<sup>34</sup> Near Natchez.

the U. S. acted in concert, and that it was the determined resolution of our Country to take possession of the Province and to use Force if necessary. Whatever measures you may take it will be necessary to keep a watchful Eye on Minor<sup>35</sup> and his Friends and prevent their being known to them. I have just seen a confidential Letter of his to the Secretary of Government in which he desires to be informed whether there is any probability of the Country opposite to Natchez being retained, and whether it will be worthy the attention of Government that he may make it acquainted with your Intentions and preparations. I shall endeavor to learn further particulars and if any thing important is discovered will again advise you. I would remonstrate with the Marquis on the impolicy of such measures and the dangers to be apprehended by him in following them, if I were not afraid that he might think it necessary to be more upon his Guard in consequence of it, and that it will not be too late on the arrival of the Commissioners to surprise and make a Prisoner of him (if they are compelled to do it) when his Views and intentions are more fully disclosed. You may probably think this advice should be transmitted to the office of State, and as dispatch has been recommended to me, I shall send the Bearer a free Negro named Thomas Bernard a confidential Messenger express to you. I shall thank you to keep him in your house until you write me in answer and send him away before his arrival is known in Natchez. I have only further to assure you that I shall most cheerfully do any thing (however attended with personal danger) that you may think proper to advise at this juncture and remain very respectfully

Sir

Your most obedient Servt.

DANIEL CLARK

His Excellency Governor Claiborne

XIII. CLARK TO MADISON.<sup>36</sup>

NEW ORLEANS 28 November 1803

Sir

Herewith I forward Copies of my Letters of the 17th, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25th Inst. to Governor Claiborne with Copies of his of the 14th, 17, 18th, and 22nd to me forming the whole of the Correspondence that has taken place between us since my last to you, and you will perceive by them the pleasing prospect that now presents itself; but it will be well to bear in Mind that the Spanish Authorities here have no knowledge of the Protest of the Spanish Minister<sup>37</sup> and that I have adopted the expedient mentioned in my Letter of the 23rd to Governor Claiborne to prevent their obtaining any information of it.

Your Letter of the 31st ulto. got to hand on the 22nd Inst. as well as that of the 12 ulto. by Monsr. Landais<sup>38</sup> who arrived late on the 25th at

<sup>35</sup> Capt. Estevan Minor, commandant of Concordia, opposite Natchez.

<sup>36</sup> Endorsed as received December 19, as are also the next two despatches, of November 29.

<sup>37</sup> Yrujo to Madison, Sept. 4 and 27, 1803. *Am. St. Pap., For. Rel.*, II. 569.

<sup>38</sup> There is here some confusion of dates. Laussat, in Gayarré, III. 608, speaks of him as arriving November 23; so also Barbé-Marbois, *Histoire de la Louisiane*, p. 352. A copy of a letter of Pichon to Clark, Oct. 13, 1803, introducing Landais as a French officer bearing the orders of his government to Laussat, is in the archives of the Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis, Suppl., 28: 195.

Night, and his arrival has freed me from a load of anxiety as I was fearful that the Prefect might precipitate Measures, and not being provided with the original Orders might therefore be exposed to a refusal which would occasion a great deal of trouble. He communicated to me his intentions of taking possession with the Militia, and placing Guards immediately over the Secretary's Office and other public Places, as well as his resolution of calling some individuals in authority to account for the administration of public funds committed to their Charge, and knowing how much he has smarted, what humiliation he has been exposed to, and the violent Measures he was capable of, if once irritated, I spared no pains to combat his resolutions and succeeded so far as to induce him to delay putting his intentions into Execution until either Monsr. Landais arrived with his Powers or the American Commissioners were ready to support him. The arrival of Genl. Wilkinson here,<sup>39</sup> and the Plan concerted between them gives me every reason to hope for a successful issue to this Business.

The General remained here but 24 hours and took his rout across Lake Pontchartrain, that he might arrive with more expedition at Fort Adams where he expects to meet Governor Claiborne and I presume they will immediately embark with the Forces that may be ready.

The different aspect of affairs from what they bore but a very few days prior to his arrival induced the General to write to Governor Claiborne that the Service of the Militia of the Mississippi Territory would not be necessary, and I am well pleased (independent of every other consideration) that the Expence attending their March will be saved to the public.

A Meeting is to take place in the course of the forenoon at Government House between the Spanish and French Commissioners to afford Mons. Lassat the opportunity of exhibiting his Powers and being recognized, the result of which I shall advise you of.

The nearer the Crisis approaches the more I shall be on the watch and attentive to every symptom that may manifest itself, of which I shall give the Commissioners and yourself the earliest intelligence.

I am highly flattered by the approbation which the President has been pleased to bestow on the details forwarded in answer to his Queries, and entreat you will make my respectful acknowledgements therefor, I regret my inability to render such further Services as I wished, but such as are within the Compass of my executions you can always command. I feel grateful for the expression of your thanks for my Conduct and will more than ever make it my endeavor to merit them. I have the honor to remain

very respectfully Sir

Your most obedt. Servt.

DANIEL CLARK

The Honble. James Madison

XIV. CLARK TO MADISON.

NEW ORLEANS 29 November 1803

Sir

I had the honor of advising under date of the 28th that a conference was to be held at the Government House in the course of the Morning

<sup>39</sup> Wilkinson came to New Orleans at this time in the course of a tour of military duty, and there learned of his appointment as commissioner to receive the surrender. He arrived on November 25. Laussat in Villiers du Terrage, p. 417.

between the French and Spanish Commissioners—it took place, and the authority of the Prefect to take possession of the Province being deemed sufficient he intends tomorrow taking the reins of Government into his hands. I waited on him yesterday at noon at his request and he communicated his Plans with the names of the Persons he designed to fill the different Offices civil and military. As his intentions had been manifested to the Governor before I saw him, it was too late to attempt dissuading him from his purpose, but he made no difficulty in making such Changes among the administrative Officers as I thought necessary. He means by a solemn act to take possession and with the Militia to garrison the Forts and take charge of the public Offices. To command them he has appointed a particular Friend of mine,<sup>40</sup> who when first applied to refused the appointment and gave me advice of it, suspecting that some treachery was intended—when I found the Prefect resolved on his Scheme I advised my friend to accept the command being better pleased to see it in his hands than in those of a Person in whom I could not confide. A Municipality consisting of a Mayor,<sup>41</sup> two Assistants or *adjoints*, a Greffier or Secretary and 8 Members among whom are to be 3 Americans are likewise to be appointed. The Customhouse he wished to place under the charge of the Vice Consul, who thinking the exercise of any Office under him incompatible with his duty to the U. S. will not accept it, and I presume he will cast his Eyes on some other American to fill that place. With the Revenue of the Customhouse he proposes to pay the Militia and the charges attending taking possession of the Country. A City Treasurer into whose hands all the City funds of whatever kind are to be paid, and who is to call the former receivers to account is likewise among the number of officers to be named with many other of inferior note which I do not recollect. A Lt Col. of Engineers who accompanied him from France is to be Commandant of the City. Seals are to be placed on all the Notaries and Registers Offices. The Processes and Suits in the Hands of the Judge now unfinished are to be lodged under the care of the Municipality who are to decide in a summary way on all Matters of Police, and affairs of Moment which would require time to finish, he means shall not be put in Suit till the American Government takes possession. The Prisoners in Jail, some of whom the Government meant to carry off he will detain, and will place Guards on all the public Magazines etc. I do not see these preparations with pleasure altho' I firmly believe he means to act honestly towards the U. S. I am fearful of Events which it may be impossible to guard against or controul and dread the consequences that may ensue. A Fete is to be given at his House on the night of the day on which he takes possession, and as it will at the same time gratify his ruling Passion and humble the Spaniards whom he would run all risks to mortify, it will increase the fermentation of the public Mind which is already but too apparent and the reflecting part of the Community reprobate the Measure as precipitate and think the delay of a few days till the Government should pass from the hands of the Spaniards to the possession of the U. S. could be attended with no danger whatever. The Prefect read to me the first Sketch of a Proclamation which he means to issue,<sup>42</sup> and it tends entirely to tranquillise the People

<sup>40</sup> Colonel Bellechasse.

<sup>41</sup> Étienne Boré was made mayor, Pierre Derbigny secretary.

<sup>42</sup> Extracts from Laussat's proclamation of November 30 are printed in Barbé-Marbois, pp. 352–354, and other extracts in Villiers du Terrage, p. 423.



*Despatches from U. S. Consulate in New Orleans* 355

and attach them to our Government. I wish however that this Experiment of his were not to be attempted as it will give the lower Classes a hankering for a French Government and will arouse that Spirit which I have long attempted to subdue. I shall give advice of this measure to the Commissioners by this days Express, and when the Prefect is in possession will dispatch another to hasten their arrival; in the mean time I shall be careful to do that only which I think most prudent in the present posture of affairs.

I remain very respectfully

Sir

Your most obedt Servt.

DANIEL CLARK

The Honble. James Madison

XV. CLARK TO MADISON.

NEW ORLEANS 29 November 1803  
(2 oClock P. M.)

*Sir*

I had this morning an interview with the prefect at his request and he Communicated his final arrangements—all seems at present perfectly agreed on between him and the Spanish Authorities and possession is to be given him to morrow at noon, when I am by agreement to forward an express with an invitation from him to hasten the arrival of our Commissioners—with the Troops. The public mind is in a high state of fermentation and to appease it I have been under the necessity of signifying that in Case of tumult or Confusion before the arrival of the Commissioners I should call on all the well disposed to rally round the Colony of the U. States and with them take effective measures to preserve the public Tranquility. all who have any thing to lose look on the measure of the prefect as premature and not without danger. I shall endeavour to Act in Case of necessity with prudence and firmness and have to favor my endeavors the unlimited Confidence of the French and Spanish Authorities, and will I believe be well seconded by the Americans and others attached to the U. S.

I remain very respectfully, Sir, Your mo obt. Servant

DANIEL CLARK

The Honble. James Madison

XVI. CLARK TO MADISON.

NEW ORLEANS 13th December 1803

*Sir*

I was yesterday favored with a letter dated the 7th Instant from our Commissioners at Fort Adams advising that their preparations are nearly finished and that they expected to be ready to embark the following day—the inclosed is my answer to it, and I hope they will shortly arrive to relieve us from the irksome situation we are in. It is fortunate that nothing has happened to disturb the public Quiet, and to maintain it no exertions have been wanting on the part of the Americans and the most respectable of the Inhabitants who being embodied have since the 30th

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXIII.—24.



ulto. done military duty with a zeal well deserving of praise,<sup>43</sup> their Example has impressed all other Classes with respect for order and has Contributed to keep up a Police to which for a long time past we were Strangers,

Having observed in the public papers the Debates in Congress respecting the Louisiana Treaty I think it necessary to point out a mistake into which Mr. Randolph has fallen respecting West Florida <sup>44</sup>—that province has never been reannexed to Louisiana since its Conquest from Great Britain nor its limits otherwise deranged than by the treaty of San Lorenzo with the U. States, they have been both under the Command of the same Governor who is himself dependent on the Governor of Havana without this Country being supposed on that Account to be annexed to Cuba, the Country East of the River Perdido and comprehended between it and the River Apalachicola is by no means subject to the Government of East Florida, but as part of West Florida is under the Jurisdiction of the Governor of Louisiana whose sway extends over the whole of both provinces as his titles in all public documents will plainly shew. The orders Communicated to M Laussat on the subject of Boundaries to the East of the Mississippi are in perfect Coincidence with the ideas of the Court of Madrid, to claim nothing on that Quarter but the Island of

<sup>43</sup> On these precautions, alluded to at the end of the last preceding letter, interesting light is cast by the following passage in a letter preserved among the Polk Papers in the Library of Congress; Woodson Wren to Polk, Natchez, Nov. 5, 1846:

"In June 1801 I landed at New Orleans with a flat boat loaded with flour, when it was a muddy village under a military government. The succeeding four years, I spent at New Orleans and Natchez. I was at New Orleans when it was delivered by the spanish government to M. Lausat the French commissioner, who had not a soldier to guard the place.

"I felt very anxious that safety and good order should be maintained until our army under Genl. Wilkinson with Gov Claiborne should arrive to receive the Province, and seeing that there was great dissatisfaction among the late Spanish officers and their friends, of low order, as also with many of the ignorant and degraded, which threatened disorder and outbreak, several American Gentlemen and myself, happening to be together at Geo Kings coffee house, the general rendezvous for Americans, were conversing on the perilous, interesting condition of the place; among whom were Geo. King, Benjamin Morgan, Col. Reuben Kemper [see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, II. 702 n.] Doct. W Flood, Daniel Clark the American consul, and perhaps a few others, when it was proposed that we should raise a volunteer company, who should offer their services to the French Prefect to guard the City till the Americans should arrive.

"We all agreed at once to the proposition, and Daniel Clark was requested to raise the company and take command of it which he did. I, being the only single man present, except Col. Kemper, who had been sick and was unable to render service, was the first that enlisted for the service. We made up a company of 2 or three hundred who served faithfully twenty days and nights, keeping the City in better order than I had ever known it to be before, and no doubt prevented the dreaded outbreak. I think this company was the preservation of order, and effected more actual good than any other service in New Orleans except that rendered by Genl. Jackson." See also Monette, *History of the Valley of the Mississippi*, I. 561, who cites Wren, then (1845) postmaster at Natchez, as one of his sources of information.

<sup>44</sup> John Randolph, in the House, Oct. 24, 1803. *Annals*, 8 Cong., 1 sess., col. 440.

Orleans—to the West he has directions to Claim to the Rio Bravo up that River to the 30th degree of north Latitude and thence further to the northward and westward uncertain, so that there appears to have been no idea entertained by either France or Spain that any part of West Florida or ancient Louisiana to the East of the Mississippi except the Island of Orleans has been Ceded to us by the late Treaty. This will place us in a very particular and intricate situation with respect to West Florida which is in some places wedged in between our possessions on the Mississippi and in others prevents a free Access from the sea to a part of those north of the present Line of Demarcation. From West Florida we are entirely supplied with Pitch and Tar, a great quantity of building Timber, Lime, Cattle, Fish etc. etc. and from the Mississippi the Garrisons and Inhabitants of the East side of lake pontchartrain, mobile and Pensacola receive their supplies. The Craft which carry on this Traffic are partly owned in Orleans and partly by the planters residing on the small Rivers and bays in West florida, the Spaniards as the Intendant informs me will suffer no Craft except under Spanish Colors to frequent their ports, and the tonnage duty if exacted on their little vessels will be an insuperable obstacle to their frequenting the Bayou St. Jean the port of the lakes by which we shall be deprived of a part of our Trade and Articles of daily Consumption and the poor planters who are equally interested in the welfare of both Countries as they are generally proprietors of houses and Property in the City as well as in Florida will be totally ruined and their settlements must be abandoned for want of a market. Should even this difficulty be got over another presents itself vizt. the duties exacted in the U. States on all Articles of foreign Growth to which those imported from West florida will be subject. The Country forming the Government of Baton Rouge raises 5 to 6000 Bales of Cotton—the Eastern side of the Lake Pontchartrain furnishes Pitch, Tar and Lumber—almost all these Articles are for exportation and if the duty is exacted and only repaid in the usual way by drawback on exportation, it will cause so much expence delay and trouble that it may force the Spaniards to form an entrepot on their side of the Lakes and thus deprive us of a part of our trade without the Revenue of the U. States being in the least benefited by the exaction of the duties which as they will be all returned on exportation will leave the Treasury no benefit and can only hamper Commerce by the Clogs it lays on it—to remedy in some measure these difficulties I respectfully suggest, that a modification of our present Revenue Laws be permitted so far as to exempt from duty all produce of West florida imported into New Orleans and entered for exportation altho' it should not be in the same vessel which imported it and to subject that port alone to the payment of duties intended for home Consumption and at the same time as this trade of importation will be carried on by planters not merchants to free it as far as it is practicable from all the embarrassments of official forms. Should the Officers of the Spanish Government of Louisiana obstinately refuse to allow of an intercourse between New Orleans or Louisiana Generally and their province of West florida I recommend in that case that the Governor of this Country be not only authorised but ordered to put a stop to all Communication whatever between the two Countries—the consequence of this will be that the Garrisons of Baton Rouge, Mobile and Pensacola which absolutely depend on us for their existence will be reduced to starvation and the inhabitants deprived of a market and of the means of procuring

supplies will make such an outcry and take such other measures that the Indendant Cannot possibly support his orders for a Week if we act in the manner I propose. The certainty that matters Cannot remain long in their present situation between us and West florida and the hope that the U. States will shortly acquire it and that any favor now granted to its trade will be but an anticipation of a right which I flatter myself its Inhabitants will shortly enjoy as Citizens of the U. States have emboldened me to lay these particulars before you for your Consideration.

I remain very respectfully Sir

Your most obedt Servt.

DANIEL CLARK

The Honble. James Madison

XVII. CLARK TO MADISON.

NEW ORLEANS 24 January 1804

Sir

Since the arrival of our Commissioners in this City, when my functions as Consul ceased, by possession of the Province being given to them, I have forbore to write to you, persuaded there would be no further need of any Communications from me, as they could be more satisfactorily made by them; but in Justification of my Conduct and in proof of what I have constantly asserted were the Views of the French Government and of the Prefect with respect to the U. S. had they once got firmly established here, I think it necessary to intrude once more on you and mention; that at an entertainment given to our Commissioners by Monsr Laussat he unreservedly informed Governor Claiborne, that Bonaparte previous to the departure of Genl. Victor from Paris had told him, that he might count on a War with Great Britain in less than 12 Months after his arrival in Louisiana, and that he must immediately after a knowledge of that Event take possession of Canada. When asked by the Governor, how he was to get there, the reply was thro' your Country—Our plan was to take Post on the Lakes and with this View we should have cantoned the major part of our Forces in upper Louisiana to have them always in readiness; he added that England had a right to half the Waters of these Lakes and there was no way of drawing a Line on the Water to separate the two Nations, and as England had no right to the Navigation, she of necessity must be entitled to make use of the Shores for her safety, therefore France had a right to occupy them, and would have done so to dispossess the English without its being possible for the U. S. to prevent them. He alluded to a Conversation he held with Genl. Dayton<sup>45</sup> who had represented to him the impossibility of our living on friendly terms with France if she possessed Louisiana, as she would attempt the dismemberment of our Country, and said he could not deny but such would be her Policy, that it was not however their fault but that of the Mountains which were the natural boundaries of the U. S. He further confessed his having mentioned his utter disbelief of the success of Mr. Munro's mission 'till officially [notified?] by his own Government, and said that had it not been for the situation of affairs in Europe, Mr. Munro would not have *dared* to propose the Cession of Louisiana to the U. S. even after his arrival in Paris. He boasted of the facility with

<sup>45</sup> Gen. Jonathan Dayton of New Jersey, formerly speaker of the House of Representatives and afterwards one of Burr's chief lieutenants, visited New Orleans in the summer of 1803.

which he could have defended this Country against all the Force of the U. S. had he only 7000 French Troops, and ridiculed the idea of our attempts to dispossess him, as he said we were unacquainted with grand Movements and unable to defray the Expences they would occasion, with many other remarks of a similar nature. I was surprised at these Communications as I knew no good purpose could possibly answer, and for the truth of them refer you to the Governor himself who could not easily get over the impression they made on him. He came to this Country much prejudiced in favor of the Prefect, but I believe he is by this time very desirous of getting fairly rid of him, and convinced that the differences formerly subsisting between Laussat and myself did not proceed from any fault of mine, but from the violence and impetuosity of his temper which led him very frequently to speak of our Country and its Government in a manner so disrespectful as could not be born by a Person holding a Commission under it. As his Language and Conduct changed so did mine with respect to him, and in his despatches to Monsr. Pichon as well as in his Communications to our Commissioners and the public here, he has given ample testimony of the satisfaction he experienced in my cooperation and the assistance I afforded him, and I may even flatter myself that it contributed more than all his own measures to preserve good Order and tranquility during his short Administration. To our own Commissioners I have given every possible aid and assistance whenever it could be useful, and shall continue to do so while my Services can avail them. They have many difficulties [to] encounter and some of those which I have long foreseen now present themselves. On these subjects however as they do not regard me I shall be silent, but I take the Liberty to suggest to you the necessity of making some immediate regulations with respect to the Shipping owned by the Citizens of the Country, and having the Revenue System put in force here in the same manner as in the U. S. as the payment of duties on our Exports (especially to the U. S.) causes universal dissatisfaction, and the people complain that in this respect they are placed in a worse Situation than when subjects of Spain, for under her Government imports from thence and exports to the Mother Country paid no duty whatever and to her Colonies but 2 p ct. and imports from them nothing. They have an Idea that the Government of the U. S. having put itself in the place of Spain, imports from and exports to them should be free of duty; that it was so contemplated by our Government, but misunderstood by the Collector, and on these subjects a Petition has been forwarded thro' the Governor to Congress, which if attended to will produce a great effect, and the Sums to be returned will be trifling. The Collector has mentioned to me his intention of representing to the Secretary of the Treasury the propriety of complying with the wish of the People in this particular, and with your assistance I presume there would be no difficulty in accomplishing it. The Shipping belonging to the Port, formerly entitled to Spanish Registers are deprived of these documents, and not being hitherto furnished with American Papers are laid up, to the Prejudice of their owners, who had they been inclined to emigrate to other Spanish Colonies instead of remaining Citizens of the U. S. would have their Vessels employed and every favor and indulgence shown them by the Officers of the Spanish Government, and it is to be hoped this Conduct will not be productive of injury to them.

I have the Honor to remain very respectfully Sir

Your most obedient Servant

The Honble. James Madison

DANIEL CLARK

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

*Public Opinion and the Teaching of History in the United States.*

By BESSIE LOUISE PIERCE, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, University of Iowa. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1926. Pp. xi, 380. \$2.50.)

THIS is a useful book. It traces the statutory regulation of historical instruction in the elementary and secondary schools of the United States and discusses the attempts of various groups and organizations to dictate the content of historical text-books. It expresses few judgments and no guesses. It states facts, and its facts are reliable. It is a real contribution at once to American historiography and to an understanding of the rise and present status of American nationalism.

It is, indeed, a useful thing to do precisely what Miss Pierce has done. To search the statutes of all the states in the Union and to assemble in order the laws governing the teaching of history enables us to perceive the beginnings of such legislation in the years between 1827 and 1860, to note the increasing, almost universal attention given simultaneously to national and to state history in the years from 1860 to 1900, to observe the expansion of the curriculum of the social studies between 1900 and 1917, and to come with an appropriate shock upon the exaggerated nationalism with which the World War, at least temporarily, dowered our legislatures. Then, to rummage through a vast mass of newspapers and propagandist pamphlets and to translate into bald prose their picturesque balderdash on the activities of the G. A. R., the Daughters of the Confederacy, the Knights of Columbus, the Sons of the American Revolution, a Charles Grant Miller, an Edward F. McSweeney, a Wallace McCamant, a David Hirschfield, constitutes eloquent testimony of the great hazards confronting a mere professor of history who essays these days to write an honest little manual for youngsters in our schools and at the same time—though Miss Pierce does not drive the nail home—convincing proof that the writing and selection of historical text-books should be entrusted to professional historians and competent schoolmasters rather than to ill-informed legislators and professional propagandists.

Miss Pierce might have done an even more useful thing if she had articulated her story more closely to the general phenomena of rising nationalism in the United States. She contents herself too much, the reviewer is inclined to think, with her record of facts; and her record of facts is a bit too arbitrary. On the one hand, "because of their kinship with history the other social studies have been considered" (p. viii) and also the laws relative to the flag and to patriotic observances in the schools

(pp. 56-65). On the other hand, "geography has not been included" and, in general, "there has been no attempt to portray the extent to which laws have been enforced" (p. viii). There are vague references here and there to nationalism, but no sustained effort to explain the nationalist causes and results of the legislation discussed or the propaganda described. Here is a large field to which Miss Pierce or some other student of like interests might profitably recur.

Minor defects in the present and less pretentious work may be mentioned. Such a statement as that "nationalism expressed itself in the nationalization of industry" (p. 12) is ambiguous, for nationalization of industry would signify to an Englishman a Socialist goal to which we certainly have not yet attained in the United States. Nietzsche should not be coupled with Treitschke as picturing "the glories of an imperialist régime in Germany" (p. 135): Nietzsche was mad, but his madness assumed quite a different form from Treitschke's and he never held the Hohenzollerns to be supermen. No doubt a too slavish following of a primary source is responsible for the reference to a "vice-general of the diocese of New York" (p. 173): it obviously should be "vicar-general". A section on propaganda of "the Roman Catholics" (pp. 171-176) reads as if all Catholics were a massed unit in defense of a particular interpretation of history. And curiously enough there is no treatment of any sort of Protestant agitation in the schools, not even of Fundamentalist propaganda against the teaching of evolution. Then, too, does not Miss Pierce devote a disproportionate amount of space to the Lusk laws of the state of New York? They were enacted in the midst of wartime hysteria and were repealed in 1923. The author incidentally mentions their repeal (p. 88), but elsewhere she discusses them at length as if they were not repealed (pp. 75-76, 100-101, 112, 127, etc.) and she reproduces them in an appendix (pp. 301-305). Some interesting cases were tried under the Lusk laws, but the details as presented by the author are overelaborated and tend to ennui.

CARLTON J. H. HAYES.

*Essays in History presented to Reginald Lane Poole.* Edited by H. W. C. DAVIS. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1927. Pp. xvi, 483. 21 s.)

AFTER three signal examples in the course of two years, the custom of honoring eminent scholars with dedicatory volumes, a practice hitherto less common in England than on the Continent, is surely gathering strength. In the well-chosen words of the present contributors, "these essays are presented to Reginald Lane Poole, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, in recognition of the services which he has rendered to historical science as an editor, a teacher, and a writer, and in gratitude for his unfailing willingness to put his learning at the disposal of his fellow-students". Considering a scholastic career of fifty years, and of



these thirty-six in the editorial office of the *English Historical Review*, no one will dispute that the tribute is richly deserved. As a form of publication, bringing together an array of miscellaneous material, the method has sometimes been deprecated. On the other hand it has certain advantages in affording space for disquisitions of critical, speculative, and tentative character, such as hardly belong elsewhere. In the present case the editor has been unusually successful in combining the work of more than a score of the best medieval scholars in a common purpose.

While most of the articles are technical and highly specialized, they are not lacking in general interest. The art of Historical Reviewing, as treated by George Norman Clark, considers in different lights the respective responsibilities of editor and reviewer, leaving the rights of the author for further discussion. Again, the Household of the Chancery, in the hands of Professor Tout, deserves the extended space given to it, for modifying a prevailing view as to the "semi-collegiate" life of the department. So marked indeed were the social and official distinctions within the Chancery, that instead of a single home the clerks were readily dispersed among several houses. Another aspect of the same department is taken up by Mr. Charles Crump, who points out the significance of a *non obstante* clause in grants of Henry IV. as an exercise of the dispensing power, a usage that was continued with variations in letters patent even after the Bill of Rights. A posthumous paper of Charles Kingsford, which appears to have been the last work of that lamented scholar, is a biographical sketch of an active officer of the wardrobe under Edward I.

In line with the chief interests of Dr. Poole himself, the collection bears strongly upon diplomatics and literature. A timely discovery in the Bodleian Library is reported by Dr. Cowley, whereby out of an old binding there were drawn forth certain fragments of parchment, which prove to be a Portuguese version, written in Hebrew characters, of the medical treatise known as the *Magna Chirurgia*. With an abundance of illustration, Mr. Madan urges attention to local styles, as a means of tracing literary pieces to their place of origin. A study of this nature by Professor Haskins ascribes from internal evidence the authorship of certain works, which had been carried far from their original home, to an Italian Master Bernard, a humanistic author of the twelfth century, who is to be distinguished from several others of the same name. Supplementing some of his former studies in financial history, Mr. Hilary Jenkinson produces the actual bonds of a money-lender under Henry II., while Mr. Charles Johnson introduces a rare and curious, if not important, instrument of Edward III. as Count of Toulouse. Space forbids the mention of other essays equally original and suggestive.

A frontispiece showing the face and signature of the distinguished presentee, and finally a list of his published works, an enumeration running to the extraordinary length of two hundred contributions, complete the equipment of the book. Evidently no pains have been spared to make it perfect in every feature. Why then a work of this character should



claim exemption more than others in the way of an index, remains a question without an answer.

J. F. BALDWIN.

*Introduction to the History of Science.* By GEORGE SARTON, Associate in the History of Science, Carnegie Institution of Washington. Volume I., *From Homer to Omar Khayyam.* (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington; Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins. 1927. Pp. xi, 839. \$10.00.)

THE chief aim of the portly volume with ample, closely printed pages which lies before us for review is to give, in as compact a form as possible, the main assured facts concerning men of science during the period covered, together with a list of the important editions and translations of the works of each individual, and a critical bibliography of the treatment of that individual and his works by modern scholars. It deals only with printed works and makes no attempt to cover the manuscript materials. This sort of a work of reference has long been needed and will be extremely useful. It represents a tremendous amount of work and a high order of erudition, but will save others many times the labor expended on it and tend to raise subsequent work in the field to its own level. An examination of the contents of this first volume of Doctor Sarton's *Introduction to the History of Science* makes one the more impatient for the appearance of the subsequent volumes on the period following the eleventh century, of which I have been privileged to make use, with much profit, in manuscript of the volume running to 1500.

While, as we have just said, the chief utility of this volume will be as a reliable guide and work of reference to past men of science, it has other features. There is a weighty introductory chapter which had already appeared in pamphlet form, setting forth the author's general conception of the history of science and the mode of approach to it which he intended to follow. At the beginning of each of the 34 chapters that follow is a short general survey or summary, giving the author's interpretation of the significance of the chronological group of men of science which is to follow. This chronological grouping is in the main by half centuries, although the first four chapters cover the five centuries from the ninth to the fifth B. C. Within each chronological section the individuals are grouped together according to subjects, such as religion, which Doctor Sarton regards as inseparable from scientific thought during this early period, philosophy, mathematics and astronomy, physics and technology, medicine, botany, historiography, law, and philology. The scope of the work is world-wide and international, and perhaps the most striking feature of the present volume is the large number of Chinese and Muslim writers who are included. The reviewer does not quite see the advisability, however, of such clumsy subheadings as "Latin, Byzantine, Syrian, Muslim, Japanese, Historiography" or "Latin, Syriac, Muslim, Hindoo,

Tibetan, Chinese and Japanese Medicine". This seems to stress racial and national distinctions in a manner contrary to the general plan of the work, and it is largely a matter of accident just what languages or cultures the individuals in a particular subject and period happen to fall under. It would therefore seem sufficient to make the subheadings simply religion, philosophy, mathematics, and so on, leaving the reader to see for himself the provenance of the individuals under each heading. The present system of headings seems to obscure somewhat the fundamental importance of individual minds. The page-headings are perhaps open to criticism in another respect, obscuring the fundamental chronological arrangement. Such captions as "Time of Abū-l-Wafā" will not guide the ordinary readers as well as would "950-1000". To find where the treatment of a given half-century occurs he must now turn back to the table of contents.

We believe that Doctor Sarton has been well advised to treat his subject in fifty-year periods, thus avoiding the fallacious impression which we sometimes derive from works on the remote past, to the effect that fifty years nowadays sees as much progress as five hundred years then. A striking feature of this volume, however, is that more space is given to the period from 400 A. D. to 1100 A. D., which used to be regarded as the dark ages, than is devoted to the much longer period from 900 B. C. to 400 A. D., which used to be regarded as the glorious period of the Greek and Latin classics when everything worth while in modern culture had its birth. And this, despite Dr. Sarton's confession, "Next to the modern period, I love most the Greek" (p. 15). This is but one way in which this work, although primarily one of reference for scientific biography and bibliography, may serve to correct historical generalizations.

Some may criticize the subtitle "From Homer to Omar Khayyam" for a history of science, and while we have the utmost sympathy with Dr. Sarton's tendency to take a very broad view of science and relate it to other activities, and realize that scientists are often woefully ignorant of these cognate subjects, we think that in view of the bulkiness of this volume and the desirability of pushing the work on to conclusion, it might be well in the later volumes to omit the treatment of some of the related fields, such as religion, history, literature, and law. For the Western world at least there are, after all, existing works of reference to which one can turn for such related subjects, and while the listing of Muslim and Oriental writers in those fields in the present volume is certainly very helpful, we have a feeling that even the extremely erudite author of this introduction is attempting to cover a trifle too much. He says for example on page 8, "it is as yet impossible to write a history of medieval historiography, but my work includes the rudiments of such history", but in his subsequent bibliographies for Latin historians of the early medieval period I find no reference to the standard work of W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter bis zur Mitte des Dreizehnten Jahrhunderts*, which has run through many editions and which contains a fuller treatment from a historical standpoint of many of the historians in question than does Manitius, whom he cites, or himself.

On the other hand one must protest against the way in which Dr. Sarton has failed to notice the association of science with magic and superstition. He himself recognizes in his introductory chapter that (page 6) "I may seem to be inconsistent in speaking so much of religion and so little of magic and superstition, but in this there is no real inconsistency". It seems to the reviewer that there is inconsistency, and he can not accept Dr. Sarton's interpretation of magic. It is not merely this that I object to, however, but that in treating of such a writer as Al-Kindī, whom he calls "the first and only great philosopher of the Arab race", Dr. Sarton states that "he considered alchemy as an imposture", but omits the fact that he was the author of a superstitious work, *The Theory of the Magic Art*, in which he accepted the magic power of words, figures, characters, and images (see my *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, I. 642-646, which Dr. Sarton does not cite in this connection). The same criticism may be made of the treatment of Thābit ibn Qurra and Qustā ibn Lūqā, not to mention Posidonius. This is coming closer than one likes to see in a history of science to that suppression of inconvenient facts which has been made a reproach to ecclesiastical historians in times past.

One is surprised to find Lycurgus unquestioningly accepted (p. 62) as a historical personage. The potter's wheel was in use long, long before Anacharsis (p. 75), and the other inventions ascribed to Greek technicians on the same page were similarly anteceded in the ancient Orient. The bald statement that Virgilius of Salzburg "got into trouble with the Roman church, c. 748, because of his belief in the existence of the antipodes" (p. 516) is apt to be misleading (see *Isis*, VI. 369), and to seem to sanction the old views of the incident. At page 681 we are told that the most important part of Abulcasis's medical encyclopaedia is the three surgical books "largely based upon Paulos Aegineta", but in the briefer treatment of Paul himself at page 479 nothing was said of his surgical teaching. Misprints seem to be commendably few, but at page 425 may be noted "quadrivium" for quadrivium, at page 549 "Hrbanus" meets the eye twice instead of Hrabanus, and at page 76 should not "Hoernlé" be Hoernle? On page 560 we find the form "Gherardo Cremonese" and on the opposite page "Gherardo da Cremona". The form, "Gerard of Cremona", employed elsewhere, would seem preferable to either. In view of Dr. Sarton's great pains and scientific accuracy in the transcription of Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit, Chinese, and Japanese words, we regret to see him adopting the spelling, "mediaeval", although he shares that affectation with the Mediaeval Academy of America and *Speculum*: but see Professor Burr's note, "Medieval", in this journal, XXXII. 789-792.

But errors of omission and commission are bound to occur in a work of such vast scope. They do not prevent us from heartily congratulating the author upon the achievement of this scholarly and generous guide to the history of science before 1100 A. D., and we look forward eagerly to

the appearance of the much-needed next volume on the later medieval period.

LYNN THORNDIKE.

*The Cambridge Ancient History*. Edited by J. B. BURY, M.A., F.B.A., S. A. COOK, Litt.D., F. E. ADCOCK, M.A. Volume VI., *Macedon, 401-301 B. C.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. xxiii, 648, iv. 30 s.)

THIS volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History* covers the fourth century B. C. Rome has been left out of the picture so as not to separate the beginning of her expansion from its further development, and Judaea and Egypt have been kept in, Judaea because to this period belongs the adolescence of Judaism, Egypt to close the old account before the new reckoning with Hellenism begins. The Greeks, east and west, occupy, as is fitting, the centre of the picture, and the title of the whole work is *Macedon*.

In connection with the planning of this section (the editing is remarkably good) two things call for comment. One is an omission—the absence of a chapter on the subject which Professor Bonner has recently illuminated in *Lawyers and Litigants in Ancient Athens*. Had this been included the name Isaeus would not have been absent from the index; in other words, Attic oratory could not have been treated so incidentally. The other is an innovation—the substitution of “the battle of the Kings” for the death of Alexander as the terminus of this period. This is as it should be. To relegate to the next volume the events of 323-301 B. C. would be to divide the history of the Athenian Empire by the death of Pericles. Alexander’s Empire was not liquidated till the decision was reached that it should be broken up into several empires.

A co-operative enterprise of this sort puts the reviewer at a disadvantage. He can not be competent to judge the work of so many specialists, writing each in his own field. For all that lies outside his own competence he must speak with little assurance. He may, however, have an opinion as to the methods of presentation used even there. Dr. Cook’s chapter on the Inauguration of Judaism invites comparison with chapter I., the Foundation of Judaism, in Professor G. F. Moore’s recent opus. The notably greater clarity and incisiveness of Professor Moore’s treatment is partly due to the fact that Dr. Cook aims at setting forth not only the changes in the character of Jewish life and outlook that accompanied the prevalence of the priestly point of view at the time of Ezra, but also the way in which the whole past literature, history, and religious experience of the Jewish people was then refashioned in the interest of this conception. Professor Moore on the contrary is primarily concerned with subsequent developments. But even so, the contrast between the two works in point of style (not of fundamental opinion) is striking. For a masterpiece of effective exposition Mr. Cornford’s chapter on the

Athenian Philosophical Schools deserves mention. It deals with Plato more sympathetically than with Aristotle; and manages with the use of astonishingly little philosophical shorthand to lead us interestingly into the heart of these two great schools of thought. The strength of Dr. Barker's contribution is intimated in its title; he relates the political theory of the fourth century to the political thought of the time, and does it with his usual breadth of vision. But the high-water mark of literary excellence is reached in Professor Beazley's treatment of Classical Sculpture and Painting: Fourth Century. The faculty which enables the critic to note and appreciate multitudes of fine formal distinctions between works of art enables the writer to marshal and use discriminatingly for their description the whole range of vocabulary and phrase possessed by the English language. Nor does he hesitate to coin a word or expression when hard put to it. As to the justice of the distinctions drawn the specialist must decide; and to do so he will need the promised book of plates. They are fresh and intriguing at any rate.

As befits its title the volume in its major part is devoted to political history, with which, of course, the economic, social, and constitutional history is interwoven. The main burden is carried by Messrs. Tarn, Cary, and Pickard-Cambridge. It is likely that science will have more to say to the findings and interpretations of Messrs. Cary and Tarn than to those of their collaborator. Mr. Pickard-Cambridge has already dealt with his present theme—Demosthenes and Philip II.—in his biography in the *Heroes of the Nations* series and dealt with it on a larger scale. Dr. Cary's period (401–360 B. C.) puts a severe strain on its historian; but he is equal to the task. He neither marks time by registering the monotonous up and down of inconclusive wars nor riles the lover of history by eliminating all that is individual and concrete to make way for heavy generalizations. His narrative skill is conspicuous and he uses it to lead us with him quickly to the issues he deems significant. The Spartans, it appears, when contrasted with the Romans and Persians, were singularly little altered in their main characteristics by the acquisition of empire. They owed their failure more to Lysander's lust of power and Agesilaus's capacity for nursing grudges than to themselves. Athens's financial inability to sustain the burden of naval warfare without "degenerating into an Algerian pirate organization" is established, but not by underestimating the profits and progressiveness of her industry, banking, and commerce. "The originality of Epaminondas' tactics lay chiefly in the choice of his point of attack: he had discovered the master principle that the quickest and most economical way of winning a military decision is to defeat the enemy not at his weakest but at his strongest point." There is much history behind the doctrine which Mr. Winston Churchill has recently assailed so savagely.

Mr. Tarn is relentlessly Missourian: he wants to be shown. There is something in his mode of grappling with problems that suggests Beloch. It is not for nothing that he is a lawyer by training; and from this slant

it is interesting to read his account of the Demosthenes-Aeschines bout and of the Harpalus affair. Relying upon an independent evaluation of the sources he freely challenges conventional conclusions: at Cunaxa Cyrus was defeated as well as killed; the march back to the coast was not seriously opposed by the Persians yet cost the Greeks half their effectives; "far the greatest thing" that Xenophon ever did was to save Byzantium from the fury of the 10,000 (Glover would doubtless say it was to write the *Anabasis*); "the one lesson taught by Cyrus' expedition was that no one need hope to conquer Persia without a cavalry force very different from any which Greece yet had envisaged"; the King's Peace "was the greatest success in the West which Persia ever achieved"; nothing happened in the 65 years after Cunaxa "to show that Persia was too weak to resist a serious invasion, especially if anything should arouse Iranian national sentiment". Such judgments as these, taken from the first chapter alone, are not calculated to lessen admiration for the achievements of Alexander, to which two of Mr. Tarn's five chapters are devoted. His general attitude may be inferred from his denials, that Alexander owed his victories to Parmenion, or to the alleged fact that the Persian armies were "huge useless mobs", or to luck; that he went to Ammon "to be recognized as a god by the Greek world"; that he had any intention "of conquering the great Kingdom of Magadha on the Ganges" (he did not know even that the Ganges existed); that he aimed at world-dominion ("A legend which derives ultimately from the Ammon ritual"); or at co-ordinating his heterogeneous mass of rights over his subjects by "claiming to be the divine ruler of the inhabited world"; that he had an illegitimate child by Barsine; or made a love match with Roxane. These are challenging conclusions and there are many more of them; but they are not advanced without reasons, and science has had, and will have, to reckon with them. Mr. Tarn's contribution is a work of extensive and minute research fortified by wide and exact reading of the modern literature. The style is terse and unrhetorical, less effective in his narrative (which suggests machine-gun fire) than in argument and summaries, but vigorous throughout.

Taken as a whole the volume will stand comparison with the corresponding portions of Meyer's *Geschichte des Altertums* and Beloch's *Griechische Geschichte*. Less unified than these masterpieces of German historical scholarship, it surpasses them in the expertness of its treatment of art, philosophy (we wish we could say literature), and political theory. In other respects it may be said to have assimilated into a new synthesis both the contribution of the major Germans and the revisions to which it has in details been subjected. It betrays less political tendency than either Grote or they. Macedon is seen to be inevitable but the city states are judged compassionately. Autonomy is held to have been compatible with centralization—a mitigated autonomy and an altruistic unification; so that sympathy is accorded to both the great movements of Greek political history. The reviewer disagrees neither with this division



of sympathy nor with the readiness it entails to recognize cordially the merits of monarchy; but he believes that in the then state of the world local self-government and national (international, rather) unification were mutually exclusive on any terms. The tragedy of Greek history lay neither in men nor governments alone but in the unreadiness of the world to supplement local public opinion by a wider public opinion strong and flexible enough to uphold and control its government.

While this volume was in the press the editor-in-chief of the series, Professor Bury, in the words of his surviving colleagues, "ended a life of brilliant achievement inspired by a single-minded devotion to learning". His chapter on Dionysius of Syracuse is one of two devoted to the west Greeks. Written with his accustomed ease and fullness of knowledge it is a worthy valedictory.

W. S. FERGUSON.

*A History of the Ancient World.* By M. ROSTOVITZEFF, Hon.D.Litt., Professor of Ancient History in Yale University. Volume II., *Rome*. Translated from the Russian by J. D. Duff. (London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1927. Pp. xiv, 387. 21 s.)

TWICE within the past eighteen months two volumes by Rostovtzeff covering different portions of ancient history have been noticed in this *Review*; and now we have the second volume of his *History of the Ancient World*, which covers the entire history of Rome from the beginning to the accession of Constantine. To deal with this long record in 366 pages is a difficult task, even for one who has the mastery of material and the sense of proportion and values that Rostovtzeff possesses in so high degree. The book is interesting from beginning to end: the reading of it stirs the mature reader's historic imagination to apprehend more clearly than before the significance of certain events and movements with which he may have been long acquainted, and above all it makes him reflect and weigh anew events on which he probably has pondered more than once in the past. At least such has been the effect on the present reviewer, who ventures to believe that far younger readers are likely to get from this work a better knowledge of Roman history and a juster comprehension of its significant elements and phases than is generally gained from some familiar histories; yet he suspects that the work is rather too mature for all except the older classes in schools.

Political and military events naturally do not hold the entire field here. The chapter on Rome and Carthage and that on Rome, the Hellenistic East, and Carthage in the Second Century B. C. (V.-VI.) are good illustrations of the author's method. In the former chapter he first sketches briefly but clearly the causes which brought Rome and Carthage into conflict; and then in a little over two pages he disposes of the details of the First Punic War—we have no mention by name of Mylae, Ecnomus,



Camarina, Panormus, Lilybaeum, Drepanum, or the Aegatian Islands. The Second Punic War is treated somewhat more fully, as its character requires, but the significance of its several phases is clearly set forth, unobscured by excessive detail. Likewise in the sixth chapter we see presented in rapid succession the steps by which Rome advanced her power, both west and east, until by 133 B. C. she was without a rival in the Mediterranean area; the diplomatic and military aspects of this rapid extension of Roman influence and dominion are adequately treated, considering the scale adopted for the whole work, but the reader is not permitted to forget the social and economic aspects of Roman expansion; and these themes are more fully handled in the pages that immediately follow. Now, this is nothing but the result of a good sense of proportion on the author's part, but that sense is not so common that it can pass unnoticed when it appears.

Rostovtzeff does not shrink from defining the causes of Rome's progress or decay, and his views are always interesting, even if they do not win complete assent. Illustrations may be found in such passages as that in which he gives the reasons for the Roman success in winning political control over Italy (p. 47), or again where he points out the effect of the provinces on Rome's relation to her Italian allies (pp. 88 f.), or in his brief summary of the weakness of the proposals of the Gracchi (p. 115), or in his statement of the causes that led to monarchy (pp. 160 f.); likewise in his account of the influence of Stoicism on politics, including the choice of emperors in the second century of our era (pp. 227-231), or in his description of the causes for the social and economic changes in the first two centuries or those that led to the catastrophes of the third century (p. 241). As in his larger work on the Roman Empire, Rostovtzeff describes at the end of this book the decline of ancient civilization with the causes therefor. On this last subject men will differ most. To Rostovtzeff the decline of Roman civilization "is not to be traced to physical degeneration, or to any debasement of blood in the higher races due to slavery, or to political and economic conditions, but rather to a changed attitude of men's minds. That change was due to the chain of circumstances which produced the specific conditions of life in the Roman Empire; and the process was the same as in Greece. One of these conditions, and very important among them, was the aristocratic and exclusive nature of ancient civilization. The mental reaction and the social division, taken together, deprived the ancient world of power to maintain its civilization, or to defend it against internal dissolution and barbarian invasion from without".

That is, ancient civilization went down in large measure because men lost their nerve. When we consider the qualities that leading nations of modern times display, we may well ask whether any better or more adequate reason for Rome's fall can be found. Yet this does not seem to be the same explanation exactly as that which our author recently offered at the close of his larger work on the *Social and Economic History of the*

*Roman Empire*, for there he held "that the main phenomenon which underlies the process of decline is the gradual absorption of the educated classes by the masses and the consequent simplification of all the functions of political, social, economic and intellectual life, which we call the barbarization of the ancient world". And even if we grant, as the present writer thinks we must, that "loss of nerve" is evident in Rome's decay, we still must ask whether the loss is a cause or a symptom of decay. The answer is not easy.

Naturally there are many details on which other scholars will dissent from Rostovtzeff. Actual slips in matters of fact, however, are rare; but it is important to note that Naevius's "history in verse" was of the *first*, not of the second Punic War, as is stated on page 99; that Plautus was certainly active during Naevius's life, and that he did not write after Ennius (*ibid.*); that Accius did not come before Pacuvius, but was fifty years later; that the temple to the Great Mother on the Palatine was not dedicated during the second Punic War, as is stated in the explanation of Plate XV. 1, but in 191 B. C.; that the attempt of the Senate to check the Bacchanal rites was made in 186 B. C., not earlier as is implied on page 104; and that the priestly college to care for the Sibylline books at first consisted of two, not ten men. In the explanatory text to Plate XVI. 1, we should read "To the *right* is an arch, etc.", for we hardly reckon direction from the object at which we are looking. It is also somewhat misleading to the novice in Roman history to call Sertorius and Perpenna "Roman generals", when they were conducting a revolt in Spain (p. 130); but all these and others are slight matters at most, which the eye has caught in passing.

As in Rostovtzeff's other historical volumes, the illustrations are an attractive and essential part of his work. Ninety-six plates are given with explanatory text; the choice of the material and mechanical presentation is first-rate. It is difficult to place full-page illustrations where they will be closely related to the contiguous text and illuminate rather than block and temporarily obscure the reader's progress. This rarely happens in this volume; but Plates XVIII., XIX., XX., and XXI., for example, are distributed through a chapter in such a way as to interrupt the reader, whereas if they had been placed at the end or the beginning of the chapter, they would have been most welcome; and Plates L. and LI., showing buildings in Rome and Ostia, are placed in the chapter on the Provinces in the First and Second Centuries of our Era, with which they have little or nothing to do.

The present reviewer unfortunately has no knowledge of the Russian language, from which this work is translated, but he can not fail to congratulate the author on his translator, J. D. Duff.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE.

*La Conquête Romaine.* Par ANDRÉ PIGANIOI, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg. [Peuples et Civilisations, Histoire Général, edd. Louis Halphen and Philippe Sagnac.] (Paris: Alcan. 1927. Pp. 520. 40 fr.)

DURING the last three years several histories of early Rome have appeared, written by men of such varied interests as Païs, Homo, Beloch, Rostovtzeff, and Piganiol. The volumes of Païs, Homo, and Piganiol are parts of larger series which aim to give the results of research in a compendious form primarily for non-specialists. Since excavations have brought to light much new information which it is difficult to interpret and since the value of Rome's tradition is still *sub judice* it is interesting to compare these various attempts to reconstruct the story of early Rome. Historians have in fact neglected this task too long. They were apparently so engaged in assimilating Païs's destructive criticism that they forgot to study the evidence turned up by the spade. And not a few felt so hopelessly lost when confronted with archaeological objects that they preferred not to see them.

Païs, of course, has not been converted. His volume still neglects Italian prehistory, and in many places misinterprets the archaeological discoveries. He also continues to belabor the jumbled legends with syllogisms and enthymemes in the hope of evoking a story that will at least appear logical. Homo, who otherwise has a more limited historical equipment, has written a far more useful book because of his interest in archaeology. By a sane use of recent finds he is able to reach a reasonable criterion for what kind of evidence actually survived into the period of the annalists, and from this he infers what part of the tradition may possibly contain reliable information. This is also to some extent Rostovtzeff's method, though of course his space is too brief to give a full report for the early period.

Beloch's volume is the least successful of the group. He has done such penetrating work in Greek history that we expected much from him. Unfortunately he returned to Roman studies only after twenty-five years of work elsewhere, and picked up the threads where he then left off without making a patient study of the new material. His book is laden with old-fashioned statistical tables drawn from a reconstructed tradition. The meagre one-third of his volume devoted to orderly narration is full of unconvincing rationalization. Even in his Greek history Beloch trusted his own intuitions too much, but there at least one can often test his hypotheses by contemporaneous documents. Here, in dealing with the first books of Livy, his method reveals the futility of compelling history to be reasonable.

Piganiol's book is in some ways the best of the five. He had good training in the French School at Rome and knows his archaeology of Rome and Italy very well. His reconstruction of prehistory and early history is as sound as any that I have seen, and—a fact that speaks well

of his sincerity—he has in the light of deeper study almost entirely rejected the bold hypotheses that he formed in his youth. The first one hundred pages of his book are excellent. The treatment of the tradition between 500 and 300 B. C. is, however, not as well thought out. In this period he is still somewhat under the influence of the Pais-Beloch method though he recognizes its weakness. Here and there he feels his way out to sound conclusions from the facts that he has established in the preceding chapters. But on the whole it would seem that he has not given himself time enough to think the matter out clearly.

In the historical period from the Pyrrhic war to Actium he gives a rapid and clear story of the facts; and with his concise style he succeeds in cramming a very large amount of matter into three hundred pages. He has not only used secondary work—which he usually knows very well—but has evidently read all the sources with care. The book has some weaknesses. Cultural and economic history gets insufficient attention and the general discussion of movements reveals no very deep insight into political psychology. (It is, for instance, difficult to believe that in 200 B. C. Rome was tricked into the Macedonian war by astute Greeks against her own better judgment.) The proof-reading has also let slip too many erroneous dates and names, and the last thirty pages show an overhasty acceptance of the errors of Appian and Dio. However, when all is said, Piganiol has written a very useful book, and in the first part he has made a reconstruction that ought to have a wholesome influence.

TENNEY FRANK.

*A Greater than Napoleon: Scipio Africanus.* By Captain B. H. LIDDELL HART. (London: Blackwood; Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1927. Pp. xii, 281. 12 s. 6 d.)

CAPTAIN HART'S own preface is a book review. "The reason for this book is that, apart from the romance of Scipio's personality and his political importance as the founder of Rome's world dominion, his military work has a greater value to modern students than that of any other great captain of the past." And he proceeds, in three hundred readable pages of excellent English, to make a strong case.

We have all seen and personally experienced the transition from the tallow candle to the electric light, from the quill-pen letter and the mounted messenger to the radio telephone. We see the connection. But the "transformations of war" have not taken place so clearly in the public eye. It is not obvious, even to the military man, that there is any connection between the legionary and the automatic rifleman, between the elephant and the tank. But Captain Hart does not hesitate to point out—and prove—that "for the study of tactical methods the campaigns of Napoleon or of 1870, even of 1914-1918 perhaps, are as dead as those of the third century B. C. But the art of generalship does not age". And

so, leaving to others to bring out the useful lessons to be found in bewildering variety in these and in all other wars, he goes direct to his Polybius and his Livy, and from them he reconstructs for us the ultra-modern soldier and statesman, Scipio Africanus.

Seldom, as he points out, do we find such reliable source-material. Polybius is his main reliance; Polybius, the distinguished general, with his Greek background and his wide sympathy, the critical student of political and military affairs, the intimate associate of the Scipio family, the close personal friend of Laelius, the interested visitor to battlefields under the guidance of participants in the battles. Holding fast to this, the author can safely use the less scientific and less dispassionate contemporaries.

We see Scipio the soldier, serving his apprenticeship on the disastrous field of Cannae, and even then taking his leading part in saving a remnant of the broken army. For the rest of his active life we see him fighting, directly or indirectly, against that same terrible Hannibal, unterrified. In his first great campaign he detaches all Spain from the enemy. During the intervals of active operations, he devotes himself to troop training—the first Roman to make systematic experiments with the conscious purpose of advance in tactics. Next, in Sicily, he makes an army out of nothing—out of less than nothing, one might say, for his only nucleus is found in the legions banished to that province for their failure at Cannae; trains it in his new tactics; convinces a suspicious senatorial commission on the conduct of the war that he is to be trusted; takes his new army to Africa, strikes at the enemy's capital, and ultimately forces Hannibal with the main army to come to him to be beaten, at a time and place where the defeat of the army will necessarily mean the downfall of the state.

Here one may remark that Captain Hart might have spared us his somewhat spiteful jeer at the "purblind apostles of Clausewitz", who have insisted that "destruction of the enemy's main armed forces on the battlefield is . . . an end in itself". Purblind indeed they must have been, for Clausewitz himself insists, with Captain Hart, that it is "at best but a means to the end". For where can we find a better summary of Scipio's objectives than in Clausewitz (book VIII., chapter 4):

"Wir glauben daher dass nach der Mehrzahl der Erfahrungen folgende Umstände die Niederwerfung des Gegners hauptsächlich bewirken: (1) Zertrümmerung seines Heeres, wenn es einigermaßen eine Potenz bildet; (2) Einnahme der feindlichen Hauptstadt, wenn sie nicht bloss der Mittelpunkt der Staatsgewalten, sondern auch der Sitz politischer Körper und Partheiungen ist; (3) ein wirksamer Stoss gegen den hauptsächlichsten Bundesgenossen, wenn dieser an sich bedeutender ist als der Gegner."

Clausewitz, like other great philosophers, has to bear the odium of the misapprehensions of his own followers; and he is the particular aversion of British writers in this post-war period. But even the British writers can not do without him; witness the "principles of war" formu-

lated by Colonel Fuller, the sole modern quoted by Captain Hart, which have been formalized almost into a moral code by us in America, and which come from Clausewitz through Foch.

Most of Captain Hart's tactical comments may readily be accepted. Perhaps he emphasizes the brilliant action of the cavalry at Zama a trifle too much, at the expense of the less showy but more solid use of infantry reserves, which forms the starting-point of modern infantry tactics. But he recognizes and emphasizes both; the proper relative emphasis is a matter of personal opinion.

Coming now to Scipio as a diplomat and statesman, we see him in action in every conceivable way. His negotiations form the complement to his military successes in detaching first Spain and then Numidia from Carthage. His dealings with his own Senate showed no mean diplomatic ability. But his most remarkable work was done in the peace negotiations with Carthage. This work, unlike his military programme, stands out clear and distinct to the eye of any thoughtful observer—but how few, before Captain Hart, have thoughtfully observed it! One instinctively compares it with that of the Versailles Conference, and we are here shown how far ahead of the modern solution was the ancient. No spirit of vindictiveness, no visionary theories, only a truly enlightened self-interest. Scipio was Rome; he fully believed in Rome's mission, and sought only to advance it; seeing clearly through all the mists, he insisted upon all those things that were for her true and lasting advantage, and refused to consider all others. The final terms are strikingly like those of Versailles, and more strikingly unlike.

With the end of the Carthaginian peril, Scipio's great work was done. Captain Hart follows him through his remaining campaigns and to the end of his life, and paints us a most attractive picture of the cultured gentleman, Roman of the Romans but with all the Greek graces, living his life according to his own nature, thrown off his balance by neither adulation nor adversity.

Truly a greater than Napoleon; and truly a delightful and convincing study. Here and there a point with which one might quarrel, but quarrel only good-naturedly and as between friends.

OLIVER LYMAN SPAULDING, JR.

*Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire.* By FRANK FROST ABBOTT, late Kennedy Professor of Latin, Princeton University, and ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON, Professor of Classics, Princeton University. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1926. Pp. x, 599. \$5.00.)

THIS book contains two distinct but supplementary parts, approximately equal in size: the first a study of Roman municipal administration, the second a collection of sources illustrative of this subject. The scope of part I. is the Roman system of local government in all its phases



from the beginning of Roman expansion in Italy until the fourth century A. D., when the municipalities were entering the last stages of their decline, and its object is to examine this decline as containing the main key to the problem of the decline of the Roman Empire itself. The subject is treated topically rather than chronologically in fifteen chapters, which deal with the various types of local administrative organization in the West and in the East, the municipal policy of the Roman government, municipal officials, and local and imperial taxation. In spite of the use of cross-references, there is a good deal of apparently avoidable repetition of statement (cf. the discussion of the *defensor civitatis* on pp. 92-93 and 201-202). The final chapter on municipal documents and their preparation is a good introduction to part II., although the treatment of the archives in Egypt is by no means complete. As a whole the work is a comprehensive and thorough investigation which marks a distinct advance upon other treatises in the same field. In their interesting analysis of the causes of the decline of the municipalities the authors, while doing full justice to the complexity of the problem, hold that the primary cause was soil exhaustion. That this conclusion is open to question may be seen from Rostovtzeff's vigorous refutation in his *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. Likewise the point of view that Egypt "as a whole was regarded as a personal possession of the crown", i.e., of the Princeps, has recently been subjected to severe criticism and is probably untenable. Part II. comprises the texts of 206 Greek and Latin documents which are accompanied by good interpretative commentaries. They include all the more important inscriptions concerning municipal government, with a representative selection of papyri. The editors have rendered a distinct service in assembling this source-material in so convenient a form. The commentaries are good and well proportioned, but those dealing with the Roman *saltus* in Africa must now be supplemented by Tenney Frank (*Am. Jour. Phil.*, 1926, pp. 55 ff. and 153 ff.; *Economic History of Rome*, ch. XXI.) and Van Nostrand (*Imperial Domains of Africa Proconsularis*). In opposition to the editors, Frank holds that the much discussed Lex Manciana was issued by a private owner, not an imperial official. The commentary on the Rescript of Gordian to the Scaptopareni discusses the view of Rostovtzeff that the civil wars of the third century were essentially a movement of the peasantry, represented by the soldiery, against the privileged town classes. The editors feel that the evidence does not support the idea of a conscious class struggle at this period. In the commentary on the papyrus fragment of the Constitutio Antoniniana of 212 A. D., they incline to the view of Segré that the term *dedeition* refers to the *civitates stipendiariae*, which the edict abolishes. They interpret the constitution as an attempt to put an end to the exemption of Roman citizens from municipal liturgies in non-Roman communities in an endeavor to strengthen the towns by a fairer distribution of the burdens of local government. There is a good index, but no bibliography. Among the references cited, I have failed to find, along with less im-

portant titles, Carcopino, *La Loi de Hiéron et les Romains*; Kuhn, *Antinoopolis*; and Milne, *A History of Egypt under Roman Rule*. Probably the important study of Victor Martin, *La Fiscalité Romaine en Égypte aux Trois Premiers Siècles de l'Empire*, and Van Groningen, *Le Gymnasiarque des Métropoles de l'Égypte Romaine* appeared too late to be included.

A. E. R. BOAK.

*Dacia: Recherches et Découvertes Archéologiques en Roumanie.*

Publiée sous la direction de VASILE PÂRVAN. Tome I., 1924; tome II., 1925. (Bucharest: Cultura Națională. 1927. Pp. viii, 368; viii, 429.)

THE importance of the northern part of the Balkan peninsula and especially of the Danube basin with the adjoining lands for the early history of Europe can not be overestimated. In the neolithic and cupro-lithic (or eneolithic) age this region together with the plain of Bessarabia and the valley of the Dnieper produced the highest type of civilization in Europe. The painted pottery of this region and of this period reached a height unheard of in the other parts of Europe and was surpassed by the later development of Minoan pottery only. In the bronze age Hungary and Rumania created a refined geometric art which finds its rival in the Scandinavian lands only. It is well known that our knowledge of the early iron age started from Hallstatt in Austria and that for explaining its genesis we must look to Macedonia and to the Danube lands. The brilliant development of the late iron age, the La Tène period, must be studied not in France and Germany only but also in the Danube lands which were for a long time the leading centres of Celtic civilization in Europe. All these periods of evolution in the Danube lands present problems which are closely connected with the most important problems of ancient history. The period of painted pottery bears on the question of the early pre-Indoeuropean development of civilization both in Europe and in Asia and on the question of the origin of Minoan civilization. The splendid development of the geometric art in the bronze age must be studied in connection with the further development of Minoan civilization. And it is well known that the so-called Hallstatt period in the Danube lands, the lands of the Illyrians and Thracians, can not be separated from the early history of both Greece and Italy. Many and important problems of European ethnography can not be solved without a thorough exploration of the northern part of the Balkan peninsula. The Illyrians and Thracians and later the Celts played a very important part in the history of early Europe and were for a long time dangerous rivals of both the Greeks and the Romans. Their gradual Hellenization and Romanization, the urbanization of their tribal life, presents one of the most important problems in the history of Greek and Latin civilization of the Hellenistic and Roman times. And last but not least the Danube

lands—a bridge from Asia and Russia to Europe—had a first-rate importance in the history of civilization of Europe in the period of migrations.

The archaeological exploration of the Danube region and of the northern part of the Balkan peninsula was in its infancy when I began my life as a scholar. Vienna, Budapest, and Prague were at that time (the early nineties of the last century) the centres of archaeological research work. Hoernes and Hampel inaugurated the scientific and methodical study of the Danube lands in the prehistoric period, Hirschfeld, Benndorf, and Bormann the study of the Greek and Roman remains, Riegl, that excellent philosopher of art, the study of the achievements of Roman provincial art and of the art of the period of migrations. In the seminars of Bormann and of Benndorf, I met many young scholars from Rumania, Bulgaria, and Serbia who were trained here for their own work of research in their respective countries. Gradually archaeological research began to develop not in Austria only but also in the above-named young states. The war which disrupted Austria has not stopped this development. Austria works hard to maintain the high standard which the Austrian Archaeological Institute reached in the pre-war times. Italy works feverishly in the former Austrian provinces on the shores of the Adriatic. Serbia is doing her share both in Old Serbia and in her new provinces. Czechoslovakia and Hungary keep up the pre-war standard of their archaeological research. Most admirable is however the activity of Rumania and of Bulgaria. Let me speak of Rumania since it is a Rumanian book which is under review.

Very little had been done in Rumania before the war. The area of the activity of such men as Tocilescu and Odobescu was rather limited. The investigation of prehistoric, of protohistoric, and even of Greek and Roman remains was haphazard and desultory. It was due to the unbounded energy and the great enthusiasm of the late V. Pârvan that this aspect changed completely after the end of the war. When I undertook to write this review Pârvan was still alive. He has since died, a victim of his devotion to his life work. It is an enormous loss for Rumania and for archaeological studies in the Danube region. In the short time since the war, in less than ten years Pârvan succeeded in organizing archaeological work in Rumania on new lines. A systematic exploration of prehistoric, protohistoric, Greek, and Roman sites was begun and carried out on a large scale. A little army of archaeologists gathered around Pârvan. Excellent reports were published with speed and accuracy, first in the publications of the Rumanian Academy of Science, of which Pârvan was one of the most active members, and in the last years of Pârvan's activity in a special review edited by him and published in French—*Dacia*, the first two volumes of which are here under review. A Rumanian Archaeological Institute has been created in Rome for training young archaeologists and historians, and a series of volumes under the title *Ephemeris Dacoromana* (three vols., 1923-1925) testifies to its

activity (Pârvan was its first director). Last but not least Pârvan made from time to time summaries of the results of this organized work in various articles, and he has had the satisfaction of seeing a large volume of his (850 pp., 42 plates and maps), dealing with all the problems of prehistory, protohistory, and ancient history of Rumania (*Getica*, Bucharest, 1926), appear shortly before his death. (See *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXII. 699, 841.)

The best idea of the activity of Rumania in archaeology and ancient history may be formed by looking at the contents of the two volumes of the periodical *Dacia* here under review (volumes for 1924 and 1925 appeared in 1926). The palaeolithic age is represented by various finds which are illustrated in the articles of Martin Roska (I. 297 ff. and II. 400 ff.). The most important and the most instructive finds belong to the cuprolithic or neolithic age and are extremely rich both in beautiful painted pottery and in plastic figures (clay and bone) of men, animals, and utensils. I mean the finds of Gumelnita, Căscioarele, Boian, and Sultana illustrated in the reports of V. Dumitrescu (Gumelnita, I. 325 ff., II. 29 ff.), I. Andrieșescu (Sultana, I. 51 ff.), Gh. Stefan (Căscioarele, II. 138 ff.) and V. Christescu (Boian, II. 249 ff.). I must mention in this connection the excellent essay of the late F. László (see the obituary notice, I. 368), on the types of the painted vases of the famous station of Ariuzd (Erösd), which was investigated for years by this accomplished excavator (I. 1 ff.).

A revelation to archaeologists who used to think that the splendor of the bronze age of the Danube region was confined to Hungary and Transylvania was the discovery of the rich depôt of bronzes in Draşna-de-Jos carefully studied by I. Andrieșescu (II. 345 ff.) and of another later (fourth period of the bronze age) depôt of Suseni (see the articles of A. Filimon and V. Pârvan, I. 343 ff. and 359 ff.). Contributions to our knowledge of later periods (bronze age, Hallstatt, and La Tène), especially of the La Tène civilization, are furnished by the reports of Pârvan (Gruia, I. 35 ff.), Vulpe (Tinosul, I. 166 ff.), Popescu (Lechintă-de-Mures, II. 304 ff.), and Stefan (Mănăstirea, II. 385 ff.). Of great interest especially are the excavations of Gruia and Tinosul. Pârvan in his article on Gruia gives fine suggestions for the vexed question of the history of Dacia in the late Hallstatt and early La Tène period, the time of the invasions of the Scythians from the east and later of the Celts from the north and of the corresponding movements of the Illyrian and Geto-Thracian tribes. Unfortunately no Scythian finds of importance were made in Rumania in 1924 and 1925. A short article by G. Brătianu on a Scythian dagger found at Bouzeni (Moldavia) is the only contribution to the history of the Scythians on the Danube. For better information on this subject we must read the first chapter in Pârvan's book *Getica*.

With the Scythians we enter the historical period in the life of Dacia. Great efforts have been made by Rumania to investigate the Greek colo-

nies of the west shore of the Black Sea and the cities, military camps, and villages of the Roman period. Two important cities were partly excavated in 1924-1925: the important Greek colony of Callatis (Mangalia) and another Greek colony, that of Histria, both flourishing centres of civilized life in the Roman period also. The excavations and the important finds at Callatis are illustrated by two articles of Th. Sauciuc-Săveanu (I. 100 ff. and II. 104 ff., cf. I. 317 ff.). Most important are two decrees of a religious association, one of which mentions King Kotys of Thracia (cf. Pârvan, I. 363 ff.). Histria was excavated by Pârvan from 1914 on. Seven reports have been published previously by the Rumanian Academy. Ours is the eighth report, which deals with the inscriptions found in the years 1923-1925, a group of forty-five texts (Greek and Latin), some of them of historical importance.

Let me mention finally some contributions to the political and economic history of Dacia published in the same two volumes: J. Carcopino, the noted French scholar, deals with the influence of the conquest of Dacia on the finances of the Roman Empire (I. 28 ff.); R. Paribeni, the famous Italian archaeologist, investigates the organization of Dacia after the conquest (a chapter of his book on Trajan, soon to appear ?) (II. 1 ff.); V. Pârvan reports on an Olbian coin found in Solsovia (II. 420 ff.), and P. Nicorescu sums up what is known on Philip's campaign of 339 B. C. (II. 22 ff.).

I have confined myself to a mere report on the contents of the two volumes, merely to show how active the Rumanians are in investigating their own remote past and how much has been achieved in a very short period. I do not intend to go into details and to express my own views on many debatable questions touched upon in the various articles in *Dacia*. Pârvan, the editor of the volumes, himself recognizes that not all the articles are of the same scientific value. However there is not one where a serious effort has not been made—with more or less success—not only to illustrate the material but also to emphasize its importance for the solution of the great problems of which I have spoken at the beginning of this review. Let us hope that the premature death of Pârvan will not stop the progress of the work which he so splendidly organized.

M. ROSTOVITZEFF.

#### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*Le Problème de la Colonisation Franque et du Régime Agraire en Belgique.* Par G. DES MAREZ, Professeur à l'Université Libre, Bruxelles. (Brussels: M. Hayez. 1926. Pp. 193 and 1 map.)

SELDOM has so much that is new both as to matter and as to method been crowded into so small a volume. Hitherto our knowledge of Frankish colonization in lower Belgium has been dependent upon a very few historical texts and upon philological, or place-name, studies which have made possible a doubtful delimitation of the region of Frankish settle-

ment without any indication of the chronological sequence of the movement by which the Franks came into the territory. We now learn that the expansion of the Salian Franks over lower Belgium, after their settlement within the Roman Empire in Toxandria in 358, took place in three stages approximately as follows:

Stage I., extending to the middle of the fifth century, a gradual, irresistible movement, for the most part without violence, whereby the valleys of the Scheldt and of the Lys were settled in force and the existing population absorbed and assimilated.

Stage II., sixth to eighth centuries, settlement of Brabant, which was almost wholly covered by the *Forêt Charbonnière*. Other peoples besides the Salians shared in this movement, and the land became a *terra mixta*.

Stage III., seventh to ninth centuries, occupation of maritime Flanders, now recovered from the ocean. This was already a *terra mixta*, inhabited at least by Saxons and Frisians. The Salians reduced the existing population to subjection after a long struggle, but they did not come in sufficient numbers really to colonize the country.

No less striking are the author's conclusions concerning the agrarian system under which the Franks settled in lower Belgium. Rejecting entirely the theory of Meitzen which associates the *Dorfsystem*, or system of village communities surrounded by open fields, with the Germanic peoples, he holds that early methods of agricultural exploitation were primarily dependent on geography. Water was the really decisive factor (*L'eau a été l'élément décisif*). Where water in abundance lay near the surface, the Franks generally settled on isolated farms. This was notably true of the valley of the Lys and of most of the valley of the Scheldt. Where water lay far beneath the surface and was not easily obtainable, villages were concentrated at the sources of water supply and the fields lay open and uninhabited. This was notably the case in Brabant, though the villages which there lined the water courses bore little resemblance to the theoretical type conceived by Meitzen. But the agrarian system was not wholly dependent on water supply: ancient custom had some influence, as did also special circumstances, particularly in the case of later settlements. In maritime Flanders, notwithstanding that there was abundance of water everywhere, settlement generally was in scattered habitations on blocks of land, because the country was recovered bit by bit from the sea.

Even more significant than the author's conclusions is the method by which he reaches them. So difficult a problem as that of Frankish colonization, he holds, can only be solved by an alliance of sciences. "Il faut créer un vaste système d'alliances, englobant, à côté de l'histoire et de la philologie, l'archéologie, la géographie physique avec les notions de géologie qu'elle comporte, l'anthropogéographie ou la géographie humaine, le folklore et l'histoire du droit." Large as this programme is, the author manages to compass it. The neolithics are made to throw a flood of light



upon the Franks; geology is brought in to locate the sources of water supply; physical geography is used to correct the location of the *Forêt Charbonnière*; the customary law is made to illuminate the *terrae mixtae* of maritime Flanders and Brabant. The author himself calls his work only an essay and a programme, and it is not unlikely that his conclusions will be modified in some respects; but as an example of method this book should constitute a landmark in historical studies.

C. W. DAVID.

*The Evolution of the English Farm.* By M. E. SEEBOHM, F.R.H.S. (London: Allen and Unwin; Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1927. Pp. 376. 16 s.)

A POWER of portraying vivid and significant detail makes much of this book very delightful reading. It is written for "those who love a farm", of whom the author is clearly one, and confines itself with rigor to the subject chosen, the English farm through all its vicissitudes, from the days of the "little dark Neolithic farmer laboriously chipping his way through life with a sharpened flint", to those of ultra modern methods of cultivation of the soil. At times the limitation of the study to the farmhouse, fields, and farm-yard is at the expense of adequate discussions of some of the wider economic and social movements with which the development of the farm is inseparably connected. "The red line of the Norman Conquest", as Maitland calls it, for example, is almost disregarded; the complicated processes of commutation of labor services for money rents, of enclosures, and the Industrial Revolution receive scant attention. For the medieval period the number of manorial surveys cited as authorities is very limited, and there is no use of manuscript material. Hence, probably, there is very little, if any, allowance made for types of manorial economy which differed from the usual arrangements of the two- or three-field estate, dependent largely on week work; and yet the more closely medieval material is studied, the more clearly appear possibilities of variation from such a norm. There are, too, a number of mistakes in matters of detail. *Denbera* were not rents, but swine pastures; the statements regarding hides and carucates and Elizabethan assessments of wages are too categorical; the relation of swine rents to pannage and herbage is not made clear; *lundinarii*, not *lundinaria*, is the common form for cotters working on Monday; Cert near Dover is Great Chart, while the use of the very difficult term *socman* is surely a little care-free. Specialized knowledge of all phases of so many-sided a subject, through so many hundred years, is perhaps a counsel of perfection, but the absence of it in certain particulars makes the book a little difficult to classify. Does it belong among specialized and technical works; or, perhaps more reasonably, should one assign it an honorable place among the many excellent books on social life that are appearing nowadays, for the more general reader?

The strength of the study lies, perhaps, in two directions. While adding little that is new in interpretation of material, it yet presents with great clearness, concreteness, and some power of imagination the daily routine of peasant life. The pit-dweller acquires personality; the details from the Welsh laws are vividly presented, an interesting chapter follows the post-Conquest peasant through his annual round, from December when the "horse is slender and the bird silent" to the season again when "the birch leaves turn yellow, and the summer seat is widowed". The accounts of different periods are pleasantly enlivened with quotations from contemporary writers, and with illustrations, many of those for the Middle Ages being taken from the somewhat overworked Luttrell Psalter. A second excellence is the great amount of information given on very specific matters: the descriptions of actual farm utensils in different ages, the number and kind of beasts in the plough, and how they were yoked, the different breeds of farm stock, the dates of their introduction, and the manner of housing them. We read of the heyday of the "melancholy goat", of the life of the medieval cat, of the domestication of bees, as well as of the history of the various breeds of the more obvious oxen, sheep, and cows. Such facts are useful. They are derived from many and miscellaneous sources, books on gardening, treatises on agriculture, housewives' companions, stockbooks of various sorts, farmers' calendars, as well as others more generally known and easily accessible. At the end there is a short general bibliography for each chapter, from which there are some surprising omissions for a work of this kind—for example, Gray's study of field systems.

From the book as a whole one gets in very readable form much that is interesting and useful to know. One receives also a strong and pleasant impression of the continuity of rural life, of the long survival in England, as elsewhere, of what may be called the "religion of Numa" with all that it implies in the way of quietness and charm. "Still the fields endure; the most ancient occupation of mankind continues."

N. NEILSON.

*Ioannis Saresberiensis Historiae Pontificalis quae Supersunt.* Edited by REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1927. Pp. c, 128. 15 s.)

THIS is the sequel to Dr. Poole's several contributions to our knowledge of John of Salisbury. The authorship of the *Historia Pontificalis* was discovered by Wilhelm Giesebrecht in 1873 and additional proof of this was supplied in 1881 by Reinhold Pauli. In the *English Historical Review* (July, 1923), Dr. Poole gave positive proof of this and showed that John of Salisbury was still employed in the Chancery as late as the beginning of the winter of 1153. The present work is a continuation of these studies, including an edition of the *Historia Pontificalis* and a critical

introduction, which serves to demonstrate the importance of John of Salisbury as an historian.

The critical discussion is particularly valuable with reference to Pope Eugenius III., the Second Crusade, the Council of Rheims of 1148, Gilbert La Porrée, and Arnold of Brescia. In a plausible assumption Dr. Poole fixes the date of John's entrance into the pope's service some time in the year 1146 while the latter was sojourning in Viterbo. Accordingly his references to the papacy from that year may be regarded as reflecting an intimate knowledge of the events which he describes. John's narrative of the Second Crusade is "mainly valuable as filling in a few details and helping towards a portraiture of some of the actors in it". Especially pertinent is that portion dealing with the disagreement between Louis VII. and Queen Eleanor and the conduct of Raymund, prince of Antioch, which aroused the suspicions of the king.

While dealing with the various canons and enactments of the Council of Rheims, this portion of John's narrative is most important in its bearing upon the divorce of Ralph, count of Vermandois, and the proceedings against Gilbert La Porrée. The latter apparently was written "when all the particulars were fresh in his mind" and probably while he was in Tusculum in 1149. This account has the advantage over that of Otto of Freising, in that it is the work of an eyewitness, and is superior to that of Geoffrey of Auxerre which was written more than forty years after the events took place and "less as a plain historical narrative than as an element in a controversy". This same intimate knowledge is to be found also in John's discussion of the pope's attitude toward the quarrel between King Stephen and Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury.

Dr. Poole emphasizes the importance of John's account of Arnold of Brescia, preferring it to that of Otto of Freising, who did not write from intimate knowledge, but "from the report of others". Thus Otto's statement that Arnold held erroneous views on the sacraments must give way to that of John of Salisbury in favor of his austerity and self-discipline. Similarly John disposes of the error of Otto, who states that Arnold "returned to Rome in order to revive the power of the ancient Senate and to deprive the Pope of his authority in the city", when, as a matter of fact, the revolution had already been accomplished and "Arnold had nothing whatever to do with the rebellion against the Pope".

The most valuable part of Dr. Poole's work is, of course, his edition of the *Historia Pontificalis*, a task for which he is pre-eminently fitted by his intimate knowledge of John of Salisbury, his familiarity with the twelfth century, and his exceptional technical skill. The edition is based upon the Bern manuscript, previously edited by Arndt in the *Monumenta Germaniae* in 1868. It is justified in that numerous errors of such elementary character in palaeography, history, and punctuation appear in the edition of Arndt as to lead the new editor to the conclusion that "at the time when Arndt undertook to edit the *Historia Pontificalis*, he had not acquired the knowledge or the experience necessary for the work". From

a less authoritative source this adverse criticism might be questioned, but Dr. Poole has clearly justified it by giving a striking list of Arndt's elementary errors (pp. xciii-xciv).

On page lxxxii Geoffrey La Porrée obviously should read Gilbert La Porrée.

THOMAS C. VAN CLEVE.

*The Privy Council of England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, 1603-1784.* By EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER, Ph.D., Professor of European History in the Johns Hopkins University. Volume I. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1927. Pp. xiv, 450. \$7.50.)

THIS is the first installment of a work begun by the author about sixteen years ago. His original intention was to write from the sources "an account of Cabinet government in the period of Walpole". Some of his earlier findings are already familiar to scholars from articles in the *English Historical Review* and in this journal. Further study convinced him that "since the Cabinet was found to be in origin the Committee of the Council for foreign affairs", and since that body first began to take shape in the seventeenth century, it would be necessary to extend his studies further back and to include an examination of the committee system and kindred matters. This led him to form the intention of dealing "at length with the council, committees, cabinet, ministers, and the King from 1603 to 1784". Two volumes—the one before us and one about to appear—are occupied in the elucidation of this subject. Two additional volumes dealing with *The Cabinet Council in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* "are completely written" and await a publisher, while a fifth and concluding part on *The King, Ministers, and Parliament in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* "is partly written and designed for publication in the future". Professor Turner has made repeated journeys to London and toiled persistently in the archives, to say nothing of making a considerable examination of contemporary printed works. While he has "tried to describe the English executive during the period" he has made no effort to treat in detail "the subsidiary organs of central government, the boards and departments which developed during that time", such as, for example, the admiralty and treasury.

Although the Privy Council was in process of formation centuries before 1603, its origin and development in medieval times have been thoroughly dealt with by Professor James F. Baldwin in *The King's Council in England during the Middle Ages*, a work of notable scholarship to which Professor Turner pays a tribute richly deserved. Because his predecessor did not extend his researches into the Tudor period the present author was tempted to work back into the century preceding 1603, but finally set his face against such an undertaking because of the inevitable delay involved. Nevertheless, he devotes a couple of tentative

chapters to the sixteenth century, in which he pays considerable attention to three articles by Professor A. F. Pollard on "Council, Star Chamber, and Privy Council under the Tudors" which appeared in the *English Historical Review* during 1922-1923, though from his own studies of the *Letters and Papers* and other materials he ventures to take exception to Pollard's findings on various points.

Professor Turner's own thesis is so succinctly summed up in a single paragraph that it deserves quoting:

The English cabinet came from the privy council. It appeared in the seventeenth century, when the privy council was beginning to decline. During a long time the cabinet developed from the older body, within it, under its shadow, separating itself slowly and in part, often disappearing within the council or in some of its phases re-establishing close connection with the parent body, sometimes seeming to be a part of it, sometimes appearing of uncertain origin and connections, until at last after steady, unobtrusive growth it became well known. It was not formally recognized, however, even though it had become the greatest organ in the government of England. During the seventeenth century, in the hands of the king, it largely superseded the privy council. In the eighteenth century it absorbed the power of the king and assumed the guidance of parliament, after which, in further process of time, that arrangement was worked out by which the cabinet came to control parliament and yet be entirely dependent upon it—the system in which legislative and executive are merged in one organism effective and responsive to those from whom power is derived.

Since the Cabinet in its present form has "arisen almost without design in the custom and practice of administrative life" and since, in consequence, "its beginning was not stated in public documents" and "its existence was not formally recognized in law" the task of tracing its evolution has been peculiarly difficult. Even the inadequate records which once existed—for example, the register of the Privy Council—have not survived in their entirety, hence "a great deal has had to be drawn from scattered details and miscellaneous allusions, by exhaustive research in a variety and large number of sources".

One can trust Professor Turner implicitly to reproduce with painstaking fidelity just so much as he has succeeded in finding and conscientiously to appraise what it seems to him to reveal. Naturally, from the volume before us, any estimate of his monumental study must perforce be only tentative. Of the sixteen chapters the first three are professedly, to a large degree, introductory to his main theme, though even here he has some suggestive reflections on the relation of the Star Chamber to the Council. Moreover, six chapters are devoted to the abnormal interlude of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate: while this revolutionary machinery contributed more than is sometimes realized to the subsequent development, it is at least open to question whether, from the standpoint of interest and importance, these eleven councils of state justify the detailed exposition he has given them. On the other hand, the significance of the Council under the first two Stuarts is well brought out, although there is still opportunity for scholars in the future—provided the materials are

adequate—to treat more fully the activities of the central government in connection with local administration.

A promise of what the author has in store for us in his later volumes may be found in the last two chapters of the one under review, the chapters in which he treats of the Council after the Restoration and the new beginnings of the final emergence of the Cabinet. Particularly keen is the discussion of the authorship of the famous plan of 1679 attributed to Sir William Temple. Among other things it is interesting to note that the pleasure loving Charles II. was decidedly assiduous in attending Council meetings.

In addition to the domestic state papers and the various Privy Council records Professor Turner makes not a little use of the reports of the Spanish, Venetian, and French ambassadors and of some contemporary letters as well. More extracts from memoirs and diaries might have brightened somewhat the sober business of tracing the origin and growth of a weighty institution, though, as it is, a few lighter bits are recorded. The late Samuel Rawson Gardiner, once asked why he did not make his period more alive, replied that he had told all he knew, and intimated that others who had examined the records less extensively than he were able to tell a more colorful story. Not always is the truth stranger than fiction. Actual slips and errors are comparatively few. One or two misprints have crept in and there are a few statements possibly open to question: for example, in the discussion of the curia regis and its descendants (p. 3); instructions were issued to itinerant justices in 1166 and 1176, but not in 1170 (p. 6); the court of requests was a sort of poor man's chancery (p. 14). Altogether, from present indications we are to have an extended treatment of a subject which has never been adequately studied and presented.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

*Het Voorspel van den Oorlog van 1672: de Economisch-Politieke Betrekkingen tusschen Frankrijk en Nederland in de Jaren 1660-1672.* Door Dr. S. ELZINGA. (Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk Willink and Son. 1926. Pp. xxiv, 311. Fl. 4.50.)

THE middle years of the seventeenth century are rich in developments of interest to historians of all schools and persuasions, but to Dutch scholars this period has special significance as marking the turning-point of their national history, whether in foreign alliances or in domestic politics and economic status. Doctor Elzinga's work treats of the relations of the Dutch Republic with France during the twelve years preceding the outbreak of the war of 1672. With Doctor Elias's study of the economic causes of the first war with England, and Professor Japikse's narrative of Anglo-Dutch relations in the years 1660-1664, it completes a valuable survey of the major triangle of European politics during some twenty-five important years. All three books deal competently with eco-

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXIII.—26.



conomic issues, and help to deliver the reader—if he needs deliverance—from the hallucination that history is what ensues when ministers write to ambassadors, and ambassadors reply.

Doctor Elzinga's thesis is that conflict between France and the Republic became inevitable primarily because of Colbert's attacks on Dutch trade, and the retaliatory measures adopted by the States General. Spanish Succession and the preservation of Flanders are reduced to fight in the ranks of secondary causes, though their alarums and excursions off-stage are sometimes heard. Their diminution is perhaps a little exaggerated owing to the author's observation of Franco-Dutch relations through the medium of the correspondence between the Republic's ambassadors abroad and the burgomasters of Amsterdam, which naturally gives prominence to commercial matters. This is not to say that Doctor Elzinga has not consulted a wealth of other material, in manuscript and in print, as his admirable bibliography shows.

The story opens with contrasting pictures of economic conditions in France and the United Provinces at about the year 1660, and introduces as protagonists of either nation Colbert and Coenrad van Beuningen. The equilibrium of this arrangement is attractive, but in spite of the moderation with which it is set forth I am still of opinion that it does too much honor to Van Beuningen, spokesman though he was of the ruling merchant class of Amsterdam, and thrice ambassador to France in these difficult years. And like all admirers of Van Beuningen, Doctor Elzinga is inclined to do rather less than justice to De Witt. Subsequent chapters deal with Franco-Dutch rivalry for trade in various parts of the world; with the negotiation of the alliance of 1662; with the war of tariffs; and with diplomacy which beat the air and made matters worse until French armies swept into Holland.

A few errata of no great moment may be noted: the greater part of the copper used in the United Provinces at this time was imported not from France (p. 45) but from Sweden; the pamphlet alluded to on page 72, note 2, and again on page 74, was not by Sir Walter Raleigh, though generally attributed to him until 1911, when Mr. T. W. Fulton in his excellent book on *The Sovereignty of the Sea* established its authorship by John Keymor; "Goosens" (p. 111) is not the proper name of an individual, but the general designation of the privileged merchants in Russia, called "ghosts" by the English, who enjoyed a monopoly of the Tsar's contracts; Thomas Mun's treatise, *England's Treasure*, referred to (p. 161 n. 1) as illustrative of ideas in regard to trade current in 1660, was written in 1630, perhaps earlier, though not published before 1664; "Carlington" (p. 233) should be Carlingford; that De Witt opposed the Triple Alliance (p. 246) seems improbable, in view of Temple's testimony that the suggestion which was later embodied in the triple league was first broached by De Witt (*cf.* Temple's *Works*, 1814, I. 311).

It is, I think, misleading to state that negotiations between England and France for a commercial treaty led to the treaty of Dover (p. 257).

Nor can I agree that France consistently urged a commercial treaty upon England, which the latter as consistently declined (pp. 258, 260, 262). From 1667 on, it was certainly England that insisted upon such a treaty, and France that evaded it. By a misprint (p. 258, n. 1), the Glorious Revolution is made to occur in 1668. The retaliatory duty laid by England on French shipping was not 3 *l.* 10 *s.* (p. 268), but 5 *s.* per ton.

VIOLET BARBOUR.

*English Local Government: English Poor Law History. Part I., The Old Poor Law.* By SIDNEY and BEATRICE WEBB. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1927. Pp. x, 447. 21 *s.*)

By the Old Poor Law as used in the title is implied the general system of poor relief in England prior to the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834. The authors seem to have felt satisfied with the sketches other scholars have made of poor relief as administered before Charles II., and also as administered during the forty-odd years preceding the act of 1834, but the period of the latter half of the seventeenth century and of the whole of the eighteenth seemed to them to invite a detailed investigation. This they have carried out by what must have proved a tireless search into local records of parish, town, and county, all over England. The result is an imposing array of recorded experiments and improvisations by a multitude of local authorities—a veritable case-book of failures and instances of maladministration it turns out to be—which render this work as useful a contribution indirectly to the study of local government in the eighteenth century as it is to the more immediate subject of pauperism. The plan of research followed helps to direct the student's attention not to legislative discussions and general statutes, but rather to every-day applications of laws and rules by some 15,000 sets of irresponsible and unsupervised authorities. In fact the book points a caution worthy of more general observance in English history, and that is, never to infer from a general statute until its enforcement has been traced locally and specifically. Such a procedure can obviously be pushed until the survey becomes exhaustive and monotonous in its completeness; but if there is one thing more than another upon which the authors of this work are to be felicitated it is the sensible selection to which they have restricted themselves of local examples sufficient in number and yet not too numerous to explain an abuse or indict for a failure. With skilful attorneyship they leave the reader satisfied that the evidence is complete enough for the purpose in hand. The cumulative effect of the whole is to furnish the student with a grounding in actual cases, so that such matters as the incorporation of guardians, the wearing of the poor's badge, the establishment of poorhouses, workhouses, and houses of correction, the farming-out of relief in all its forms to contractors, the punishment of vagrancy, and the enforcement of the law of parochial settlement—all are displayed

through examples attested by local records, the whole forming an intimate working introduction to the law of 1834.

The emphasis placed upon the complete breakdown of schemes to turn the labor of the indigent to profitable employment through workhouses and a parish or town stock may perhaps be due to the authors' fear that a similar plan may be broached by ill-advised thinkers at the present juncture in British unemployment. Indeed the conclusion seems warranted that the authors' analysis of the old poor law was perhaps inspired by an actual project of legislation in mind—a project born of long experience as watchful critics of civil service and especially poor-law administration.

The student using this book may need to be reminded that a general statute working smoothly may leave almost no trace in local records. It is the failure, the breakdown, the departure from the general principle that looms up large in institutional and official reports, and catches the attention of investigators. To choose one instance: when an act of 1819 provided for the return to Ireland of Irish beggars and vagrants it had the effect, upon the testimony of no less an observer than Dr. Chalmers, of inducing indigent, underpaid, Irish navvies no longer to solicit poor relief. This anticipated outcome would not appear in local records; and, restricted as the authors of this book are to an almost exclusive reliance upon local institutional and official reports, this result of a general statute not attested locally escapes their attention. On more fundamental issues, such as the existence of a *right* on the part of the indigent to relief, the opinions of the authors seem to the reviewer hardly well taken; but for the restricted sphere of local administration, involving the testing of administrative devices by often indifferent authorities through all the changing moods and fads of the country gentry and parish ratepayers of the eighteenth century, no work could have been compiled more carefully.

C. E. FRYER.

*Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte an den Deutschen Universitäten.*

Von EMIL CLEMENS SCHERER. (Freiburg i.B.: Herder. 1927. Pp. xxx, 522.)

IN his preface Emil Clemens Scherer regards the history of universities as one of the most perfect expressions of the general cultural development. That this is true for Germany at least will be readily believed after reading Tholuck's *Das Akademische Leben des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Paulsen's masterly *Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts*, or the new history of Marburg University by Hermelink and Kaehler. Scherer's work deals only with the teaching of history from the age of Humanism to the end of the eighteenth century and it is a notable illustration of German thoroughness, being based not only on the immense number of books and articles concerning university history and personal biographies, but especially on *Vorlesungsverzeichnisse*, arduously sought, and the study

of bygone histories by professional authors. If it is melancholy to note how these many men and books are hid in oblivion, there is cheer in the evidence that their endeavors built up a highly differentiated and systematized knowledge to light the path that humanity has travelled. This detailed investigation reveals the evolutionary process by which a narrative homogeneity became this system of differentiated themes and processes of research and critical determination of fact, and it gives Scherer a secure and substantial basis for instructive generalizations as to the course of this development.

History teaching in German universities began with the desultory lectures of young humanists in exposition of Greek and Latin historians, the first instance being Peter Luder in Heidelberg in 1456. An extension to German history was due to Conrad Celtes, indignant at Roman aspersions on the early Germans, and he it was who in Vienna in 1497 attempted the first complete and connected course on the history of the world. The great impetus was given by Melanchthon, especially by his course on universal history, begun in 1555, and by his revision of Carion's *Chronik* as a basis for the study. This is a narration of the work of Divine Providence in terms of the World Monarchies of the Book of Daniel, though Melanchthon's preface discriminating secular and ecclesiastical material was the germ of new constructions. His pupils soon made it evident that history falls into several great series of facts requiring separate treatment as political history, church history, history of literature. Church history was made a separate course for the first time by the statutes of Helmstedt in 1576, and the first manual of this separate subject was that of Johann Pappus (1584).

More complex developments came from territorial readjustments due to the Thirty Years' War. Jurists were forced into arguments from history seen in a purely secular aspect and there was much to whet the critical faculty and to require discussions of methodology. This has its typical expression in Conring at Helmstedt (1741 ff.), who taught history as a preparation for service of the state. The political and legal interest now dominant ended the theological construction based on Daniel. Scherer's elaboration of this story in all its minutiae throws into high relief the name of Mosheim as initiating a modern, impartial, uncontroversial treatment of church history and treating the church as a society of beings subject to the laws of secular history.

Scherer, who is a Catholic scholar inspired by so admirable a historical teacher as Albert Ehrhard, treats the Catholic universities apart, and provides us with valuable and less familiar knowledge concerning them. In contrast to Protestant participation in forward movements of thought the Catholic institutions were long held fast in scholastic traditionalism, since all except Salzburg were in charge of the Jesuit Order with whom the *ratio studiorum* of 1599 reigned as unchanging law. This instrument excluded history, and it was only in the eighteenth century that change could come through the leadership, in the courts of sovereigns, passing

from the hands of theologians to nobles in administrative posts. By the intervention of monarchs universal history found a place in the universities by the middle of the century and *Rechtsgeschichte* belonged to the faculty of law. Only in Würzburg where history belonged to the theological faculty did church history receive any special consideration. A marked change in the whole situation came in 1746 when Maria Theresa intervened to appoint a layman to a chair of history in Prague and to order the selection for office of those who had studied history and public law. This breach in Jesuit monopoly was followed by the decree of 1752 reforming the curriculum in Vienna, making church history prerequisite for theological students and secular history for intending jurists. Owing to the inferiority of the Catholic universities under Jesuit control students had long resorted to Protestant centres and were now spreading the Rationalism of Wolff and Thomasius and the theory of the absolute state due to Hobbes and Pufendorf. Finally came the dissolution of the Jesuit Order in 1773, followed by more complete reorganization of the universities. Scherer's exposition of the status of church history shows how in content and method it now reflected the *Aufklärung* and was an instrument for the nationalistic and rationalistic policies of Joseph II. Any new evolution had to wait until the Romanticist movement revived the Catholic consciousness and restored contact with an earlier day. Then at last the path opened for men like Möhler and Döllinger. It is to be hoped that Scherer will continue the story.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

*Le Dernier Siècle de la Rome Pontificale, 1769-1814.* By FERNAND HAYWARD. (Paris: Payot. 1927. Pp. 238. 15 fr.)

M. HAYWARD, a devout lover of Christian Rome, has addressed himself to the task of evoking "the original and characteristic physiognomy" of the Rome of the Popes in its last phase, during the century preceding 1870, before it began to assume a new character as the capital of a modern kingdom. In the volume here reviewed he covers the pontificates of Clement XIV., Pius VI., and Pius VII. In the second he will complete his picture with an account of the interests and changes of the period from 1815 to 1870.

If M. Hayward's book may be said to have a thesis, it is that the final epoch of pontifical Rome, through whose remains the modern visitor is often inclined to push, as if through a superabundant debris, to find the Rome of the Renaissance or the Rome of classical times, produced a life far more charming than is generally supposed. With devotion and skill M. Hayward reconstructs this life, "made up", as he says, "of ecclesiastical intrigues, popular rejoicings, processions and religious solemnities, worldly fêtes, and academic sessions", expressing its quick satire in the lampoons of Pasquino and Marforio, subject to a government that was medieval in form but patriarchal and benevolent in spirit. Especial atten-

tion is bestowed upon the conclaves, the popes, and the dominant personages of their court, as at once determining and illustrating the interests of society. The appearance of the city, the manners and interests of all its classes of people, and the continual pageantry of its life are reproduced with studied precision of color as they are found reflected in the impressions of witnesses. The result is an interesting and delightful essay in *Kulturgeschichte*.

The author "makes no pretense to reveal anything unpublished". He is escorted on his way by the authors of the abundant French and Italian literature of the subject, and he has supplemented their findings from the materials supplied by the etchings of Pinelli, with which the volume is handsomely illustrated, by the dialect poetry of Belli, and by the memoirs and biographies of such visitors as Alfieri, Goethe, Chateaubriand, Madame de Staël, and D'Azeglio. M. Hayward's method, his interest in local color, requires a frequent resort to anecdotes and "*petite histoire*"; but he shows himself a master of the difficult art of subordinating such material to the unity of his picture.

The picture that results is of interest not only for Rome but for an interpretation of Italian life on the eve of the Risorgimento. One sees a boatload of pleasure-lovers, a happy and excitable family, drifting on the calm waters of a bay, playing with everything, with ideas, with human relations, with their religion, isolated and provincialized by their pride and their unique position. The deep begins to stir, as the revolution approaches, and they have no capacity for handling their antiquated craft. One feels how remote all this is from the *spiritus capitalisticus* which abolishes holidays and idealizes a society regimented for co-operative productivity: how enormous the task of the Risorgimento! This life was charming; perhaps that fact needs emphasis; but does not the author make it seem a little too charming? The celebrants are always joyous; the patricians and abbés of worldly society are always diverted. There is nothing in this book to suggest the ennui that is the disease of such societies. Again, this eighteenth century was a moment when Italy was once more producing great men. One notices that of these only two, the poet Monti and Ercole Consalvi, may be called products of Roman society.

Finally, the reader feels the need of a more profound study of the economic changes of this society. Before the sketch of cultural physiognomy which the author essays can be complete, more studies like those which Prato and Pugliese have made for the same period in northern Italy will be necessary. It is possible that the second volume will do something to supply this defect.

KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD.



*Det Danske Folk under den Fri Forfatning.* Af POVL ENGELSTOFT, H. P. HANSEN, og P. MUNCH. [*Det Danske Folks Historie*, edited by AAGE FRIIS, AXEL LINVALD, M. MACKEPRANG. Bind VII.] (Copenhagen: Chr. Erichsen. 1926-1927. Pp. 494. 14.50 Kr.)

SINCE the publication of *Danmarks Riges Historie* in 1896-1907, no authoritative general history of Denmark has appeared. A wealth of fresh materials and new points of view have led the editors to attempt a new synthesis. The present work promises, at least in its title, to lay its emphasis on the "people" rather than on the "state". The former work, presented in a sumptuous format with a wealth of illustrative matter, was composed by seven authors. Eighteen scholars are engaged upon the present work. Even in small countries, the day of the one-man general history seems to have passed.

The last two volumes (VII. and VIII.) are planned to deal with the period from 1848 to 1925, marking a shift in emphasis that should delight the soul of the "general reader". The student will note with satisfaction that each section is provided with well-arranged bibliographical material. How far the editors and authors will succeed in producing a "history of culture" that is very much different from others of the species will appear when the remaining volumes have come out.

The story of Denmark's emergence as a constitutional state in 1848 is told by P. Engelstoft, the industrious editor of *Dansk Biografisk Haand-leksikon*. The interest naturally centres about the Sleswick question during the momentous years—for Denmark—of 1848-1864, which is here presented fairly and frankly with no appreciable bias. Matters like the struggle of the lower middle classes for greater economic freedom, the beginnings of the Danish railroad system, the fight for local self-government in cities, towns, and communes, the slow emergence of agriculture and industry, and the signs of decline of the landed aristocracy, are dealt with succinctly and with penetration. Two sections, one dealing with Denmark's foreign relations, 1864-1901, the other describing how the people lived, 1864-1914, are from the pen of Dr. P. Munch, one-time member of the Radical Zahle ministry, and more recently Denmark's representative at the League of Nations. H. P. Hansen (or Hansen-Nörremölle), for a generation leader of the Danish movement in Sleswick, and its representative in Berlin from 1896 to 1919, presents an account of "South Jutlanders under Foreign Rule". Upon Hansen devolved the difficult task of telling a story in which he was a chief actor. At times lacking somewhat in objectivity, his story is told convincingly, honestly, and with dramatic simplicity; also with a modesty that fails to satisfy the curious reader as to Hansen's own tireless labors. Still, he presents us an interesting chapter in the history of minorities, no doubt the best account now available in print that describes how the Danish national sentiment in North Sleswick was kept alive during and after the Bismarck era.

Dr. Munch in his treatment of Danish foreign relations after 1864 appears remarkably fair and moderate in tone. While the Sleswick question now as before is the main theme, he does not lose sight of its larger European relationships. For the earlier period, he has the great advantage of the scholarly industry of Professor Aage Friis,<sup>1</sup> and the recently published documents from the Berlin archives.<sup>2</sup> England among the Great Powers is given credit for following Denmark longest in trying to avoid war. Sweden-Norway, where sentiment favoring a Scandinavian union still lingered in certain high places, gave Denmark its diplomatic support throughout, and Norwegian and Swedish volunteers hastened to enroll with the Danish army when war was begun. French disinclination to co-operate with the English government weakened the efforts of neutrals to bring about peace. The failure of the London Conference of 1864 marked the end of the system of conferences established at Vienna in 1815, and the beginning of German hegemony in Continental Europe. With respect to the plebiscite for the North Sleswick communes, to which Prussia and Austria agreed in the now famous Article V. of the Treaty of Prague, Hanssen concludes that the blame for the early failures at fulfilment must be borne by William I. rather than by Bismarck. Munch agrees with Friis<sup>3</sup> that the responsibility for its abrogation must rest on Bismarck alone. The Chancellor had toyed with the idea of getting the troublesome "pledge" out of the way as early as 1874; but agreement was not concluded with Austria until April, 1878, when Bismarck was clearing the decks in anticipation of his rôle of "honest broker" in the approaching Peace Congress. The Austro-Prussian agreement was kept a profound secret, however, until February, 1879, and on being published was post-dated to October 11, 1878, which happened to be the precise date on which Christian IX. of Denmark had informed Francis Joseph of the approaching wedding of his daughter to the Duke of Cumberland. Bismarck was annoyed at the thought of a marriage that seemed to bring Denmark closer to the Hanoverian and English royal houses. The Danish government had weakened its position juridically, Munch concedes, by admitting to Germany that it had no legal right to insist on fulfilment of Article V., a position that the government failed to make known to the Danish public.

The concluding section (pp. 327-494) deals with "How the Danish People Lived, 1864-1914". Here Dr. Munch, himself trained as an economic historian, presents an impressive and informing account, at times heavily weighted with statistics, but generally illuminating. After the

<sup>1</sup> Aage Friis, *Den Danske Regering og Nordslesvigs Genforening med Danmark* (Copenhagen, 1921); *Det Nordslesvigske Spørgsmaal 1864-1879* (*ibid.*, 1921, 1925); *Danmark ved Krigsudbrudet Juli-August 1870* (*ibid.*, 1923).

<sup>2</sup> *Bismarck und die Nordschleswigsche Frage 1864-1879*, edited by Platzhoff, Rheindorf, and Tiedje (Berlin, 1925).

<sup>3</sup> Aage Friis, "Die Aufhebung des Artikels V. des Prager Friedens", *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXV. 45-62.

loss of two-fifths of its territory in 1864, Denmark on the one hand became rapidly industrialized, and on the other rose to the position of a model agricultural state. It became intensely democratic in its political structure, and intelligent and responsible farmer and labor elements sought and gained important influence in its councils, along with representatives of the professional and learned classes. This advance is explained by Dr. Munch as due to a number of causes, among them common schools of long standing, close alliance between men of science and the mass of the producers, and the peculiar ability developed by the latter, on the basis of patient experiment, to co-operate in their own interest. Co-operative stores, banks, savings and loan associations, packing houses, creameries, exporting societies—all served as training schools in citizenship and statesmanship.

Volumes VII., I., and II. have appeared; the others are to come in their regular order. The present volume straightens out many a tangle in recent Danish history, and is a genuine contribution to our historical knowledge of Northern Europe.

WALDEMAR WESTERGAARD.

*Europe and Africa*, being a revised edition of *Intervention and Colonization in Africa*. By NORMAN DWIGHT HARRIS, Professor of Diplomacy and International Law, Northwestern University. [International Politics, volume I.] (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1927. Pp. xviii, 479. \$4.00.)

AMERICAN students of international politics who realize that the interrelations of certain European countries, together with the United States, Japan, and China, are not the sole matters of importance discoverable within that particular domain of thought, owe thanks to Professor Harris for his cultivation of a field, the broader aspects of which are so largely neglected. On this point, were one to judge from their literary output, nations possessing territories in the Dark Continent are quite unfamiliar with the dependencies of their fellows and none too well acquainted with their own. The paucity of books on the subject and the nature of many of them supply the proofs. To the popular, and perhaps also to the scholarly mind, in the United States at all events, Africa is apt to signify mainly the place whence negro slavery came. The author indeed is to be commended all the more, because he is not only the outstanding but virtually the sole American publicist and historian who has given preferential attention to an entire continent of our darkest ignorance.

The present work is a revised edition of the treatise he published in 1914. It bears a different title and has undergone enlargement in several respects. The chronological ground between that date and 1926 has been covered to the extent of sixty-four pages, a considerable portion of the text rewritten, the bibliography doubled and the index quadrupled in size, and a new map added. The bibliography also has been subjected to a

radical rearrangement. It omits references to "recent publications of most value to students and the general reader", placing the items in strictly alphabetical order and confining itself no longer to "secondary works". An earlier appendix concerned with revenues and expenditures, imports and exports, as also a note on Egypt, have been replaced by a somewhat general description of the "mandates system".

Except for a new one on Rhodesia, the chapter-headings remain the same. The work begins with a glance at European expansion and world politics from about 1870 onward. This is followed by two chapters on the Congo region and six on German, British, and French activities in various parts of the Continent, exclusive of the area to the far north. Six more are then given over to what the author terms the "reoccupation of northern Africa", treating respectively Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, Tripolitania, Egypt, and the Sudan.

Designed as a manual for college students and the general reader, the volume provides a survey of international politics relative to the greater possessions of the chief European states. The smaller colonies, Liberia, Abyssinia, and the Portuguese dependencies are passed over lightly, on the ground, either that they "have had little bearing upon the general issue" or have "not been materially affected by the general competition for land in the Dark Continent" (p. iv). The volume, accordingly, can not be regarded as a history of Africa as such within the period under consideration.

Useful as the work is, despite its limitations in time and subject-matter, there are certain features of it that suggest constructive comment. At the outset one might question the desirability of retaining as a subtitle, "intervention and colonization". Strictly speaking, the two words are scarcely applicable to what has happened in Africa at large. Moreover, to describe the acquisitions of territory, including the Sudan, by the modern nations of France, Great Britain, and Italy as a "reoccupation of northern Africa by Europe" (p. 245 and headings of chapters X.-XV.) seems rather a far cry from the holdings of ancient Rome, which were neither "European" nor yet conterminous by any means with the huge areas now wholly or mainly under the control of those nations.

For a theme so little known the reader misses an adequate background. In view of the initial statements, he can hardly think of the process of European expansion as anything other than a comparatively novel phenomenon revealing characteristics altogether distinct from those of the great movement, the world over, which traces its origin back to the fifteenth century at least. He might like to learn moreover just what the precise terms of that "general rule of international law" are, which enables anyone to claim "control of everything in sight" (p. 73). He may not follow readily the author's explanation of why he left so much of the chapter on Morocco "as written in 1914 to preserve the pre-war atmosphere" (p. 278, n.). If so preserved in this case, why not also in the parts of all other chapters which in subject-matter antedate 1914? Even

with reference to Morocco alone, the "emendations" and "omissions" are not always sufficient to remove a certain lack of intelligibility.

One might ask, furthermore, why such scant attention is vouchsafed to the very serious native side of the problem of relations with Europeans in Kenya, and to the international complications that have arisen in regard to Tangier. A similar query might be put in reference to the Spanish and French subjugation of the Riff country—not "principality". Absence of any allusion to Abd-el-Krim, his heroic struggle against the foreign invaders of his homeland, and his tragic fate at their hands, seems quite inexplicable. Should an inference be drawn that Class C mandates are not "subject to the supervision" of the League of Nations (p. 84)? Since when has Rhodesia been a "Dominion" (p. 241)? A better name for the southern portion of it might be a "Nondescript". Is not the account in general of British and French policies rather more laudatory than the facts would warrant?

Rather than to have inserted merely a brief foot-note, the appendix that supplies a summary of territories in Africa held or controlled by European states might well have been enlarged so as to indicate the situation at the present time in contrast with that in 1914. A course of revision more elaborate still could be applied to the bibliography. Apart from the question whether an alphabetical, instead of a topical, arrangement of the items would have been helpful in the suggestion of literature on a subject so little studied, the chief defect lies in the total lack of annotation. Other blemishes noticeable are the inclusion of college manuals on modern European history, along with certain more or less casual books of travel, and the exclusion of works that possess far greater merit in their bearing upon the subject in hand. The author's principle of selection indeed is a bit hard to understand. Under the caption, "Imperialism—Colonization—Diplomacy", for example, one might reasonably expect to find the works of Bowman, Lindley, Pavlovich, Moon, Viallate, Woolf, Zimmermann, and Supan—to say nothing of treatises relative to the export of capital. Regarding special topics, Leys on Kenya, Morel on Morocco, and Hole on Rhodesia do not appear. From the list of general accounts of Africa are missing Powell's *The Last Frontier*, Morel's *Africa and the Peace of Europe*, and the works of Jones, J. H. Harris, Woolf, Ronze and, above all, Darmstaedter. So too, except for the book by Willoughby, treatises on racial problems and missionary endeavor, such as those by Evans, Cotton, Alston, Oldham, Spiller, Smith, Meynier, Mesnage, and Allier, remain without mention. If by way of extenuation it be pleaded that several of the foregoing are not directly concerned with international politics, the same is true of numerous items in the bibliography as it stands. And since Africa, like Asia and the Pacific islands, is a region where racial problems figure so largely and necessarily in international politics, they should not be left out of consideration.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

*Morales et Religions Nouvelles en Allemagne: le Néoromantisme au delà du Rhin.* Par ERNEST SEILLIÈRE, Membre de l'Institut. (Paris: Payot. 1927. Pp. 313. 25 fr.)

BARON ERNEST SEILLIÈRE seems not to have won much mention in America although for twenty years his works have evoked discussion in Germany and Italy and have necessitated a growing French literature of exposition and criticism by Henri Lichtenberger, Louis Estève, René Gillouin, J. M. L. Boudeau, and many others. Of his publications, so numerous that Boudeau uses twenty-seven pages to list them, the most important for consideration of his thought are the four volumes of his *Philosophie de l'Impérialisme* (1903-1908) and the collection of articles entitled *Introduction à la Philosophie de l'Impérialisme* (1911). It may be permissible to rehearse the main points of this psychology or philosophy of modern history which in his latest work is applied to the study of publications showing the present tendency of German thought concerning national life and culture.

In 1890, at the age of twenty-five, Seillière left the military career for which he was trained in the École Polytechnique and, already in fluent command of German, resorted to the University of Heidelberg for laborious and methodical study of the modern movement of historic life. Apparently the growing German aspiration for *Weltmacht* fastened his attention on the theme of imperialism in its importance for social psychology. He speedily discovered more forms of "imperialism" than the purely political and traced them all to their source in the fundamental tendency of every being to expand and to dominate over its environment. This is the dynamic of all human progress, especially when it passes from individual ambition to a higher collective form, and may be censured only when acting as mere natural instinct without being rationalized by reflection, remaining undisciplined by humanity's social experience incorporate for the control of life in its creation of family, city, fatherland. If so restrained and directed, the selfish individual urge gives way to group imperialism and in the process of evolution is tending to an age when mankind, governed by rational understanding of its true interest, will follow the imperialistic bent only in domination of nature by scientific means and in the development of rational character. In that far-off divine event antagonism between man and man will have vanished. For this perfectioning of human nature Christianity is necessary since it is the true and tested school of ethical reason.

But Seillière's chief originality is in the discovery that the imperialistic urge is always associated with a mystical element, a metaphysical sense, or conviction of support from a supernatural power. The instinct for dominance is spurred by the faith and certainty of such an alliance, but this mystical element, an eternal datum of human nature, needs to be rationalized by Christian experience which exhibits only an arduous process of slowly becoming an ally of Divine Providence. From his knowl-



edge of genetic psychology and human evolution Seillière gives his benediction to a mystico-rational imperialism.

Surveying modern society with these convictions Seillière finds it inundated by a mysticism quite emancipated from the restraints of Christian reason. Even the first generation of the Encyclopedists retained Christianity's wise distrust of human nature, but thereafter came an irrational mystical glorification of mere instinct as divine. Genetic psychology and evolution show this to be a reversion to primitive type. The chief author of this evil was Rousseau, the Rousseau who, influenced by Madame de Warens and the erotic literature which he read, lost grip on the reality of life, lived a *vie fictive*, and substituted a dream of nature as ideally good for the stubborn fact of man's hard moral task. Rousseau was the Messiah of Romanticist indulgence in a dream world where blind instinct reigns supreme and irrational. Seillière has devoted many books to the study of this menace to the rational life in its varied forms of racial mysticism (Gobineau, Pan-Germanists), social mysticism (Saint-Simon, Fourier), the mysticism of passion defiant of social law (George Sand), and the aestheticism which isolates artistic genius as divine and is anti-social in moral attitude.

With this outlook on life Seillière in his latest work now under consideration studies Neo-Romanticist movements in Germany as illustrated by Troeltsch, Thomas Mann, Vossler, Langbehn, Macready, Tillich, Keyserling, Leopold Ziegler. These influential authors advocate a spiritual life not held down to the limits of positive science but guided by the intuitions due to a participation in a Power above the Nature which science describes. These counsels range from the sobriety of the theologian Troeltsch, pleading for a return to the religious idealism in which German Romanticism found its first expression, to the extravagances of Leopold Ziegler who, conceiving religion as man's aspiration to supplant all Gods, offers an elaborate analysis of history to show that the German soul has by its endowment and tradition a mission to reform life in terms of this Ultra-Humanism. A chapter of peculiar interest deals with the career of Julius Langbehn (d. 1908), author of *Rembrandt als Erzieher*, an anti-Prussian Pan-Germanist, "elect brother to Nietzsche". His famous book published in 1890 is still active on German minds, having passed from its sixty-first to the sixty-sixth edition since 1918. Most important, perhaps, are the pages which with rare skill expound the difficult thought of Paul Tillich, a challenging genius in the field of speculative theology, hampered in a worldly way by his sympathy with a certain type of Socialism. With incentive from Spengler, Tillich offers a new metaphysic of history, surveying the past and prophesying the future, not as reality is constructed by the method of Descartes or Spinoza or by empiricists like Bacon or Hume, but by a mode of thought which comes through German mystics and Romanticists and culminates in the now prevalent Irrationalism. This view of experience does not explain aspects or laws of the world but has an agitating intuition of violent in-

trusions of Eternity into the flow of time, making the world's hour a Kairos, a critical juncture dynamic with absolute content. Tillich proclaims an irruption of the Eternal in our day, a Kairos of the present hour, fateful for our bourgeois civilization. This is the movement issuing from Marx and Nietzsche blending in a Romanticist religious socialism homesick for a new and sacred reality.

Historians can not be indifferent to such modes of thought which are actual factors in the shaping of social movements. Conceptions of national destiny have their effect. One of these writers, Karl Vossler, says that for its subjects the *Imperium Romanum* had metaphysical and cosmical significance, and in Romans xiii the Apostle Paul said as much with undeniable effect. Historians have already credited Nietzsche with causative influence on German history. Thomas Mann, who has the listening ear of Germany, ascribes Germany's entrance into the Great War to Romanticist impulsions and he forecasts salvation for Germany through a synthesis of Romanticism and Goethe, with Nietzsche as a guide through the difficulties.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

*Prize Law during the World War: a Study of the Jurisprudence of the Prize Courts, 1914-1924.* By JAMES WILFORD GARNER, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Science in the University of Illinois. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. xlviii, 712. \$6.00.)

PROFESSOR GARNER had already placed students of international law under great obligations by his almost monumental work on *International Law and the World War* and his *Recent Developments in International Law*. He has now placed them under perhaps even greater obligations by the publication of *Prize Law during the World War*.

One of the greatest handicaps to the Anglo-Saxon student of international jurisprudence (which should be based upon world practice) has been the lack of access to actual decisions of judges, particularly those of Continental Europe. This want Professor Garner's most recent work goes far to supply in respect to the subject of which it treats, especially if studied in conjunction with Professor Verzijl's recent work entitled *Le Droit des Prises de la Grande Guerre*.

As stated in the preface, this work is an attempt to give a "survey of the organization, function, and jurisdiction of the Prize Courts during the World War, to analyze the mass of prize jurisprudence, which may be said to constitute the most important contribution of the war to international law, to summarize and compare the interpretation and the conclusions of the Prize Courts of the different countries in which such tribunals were organized and to point out the divergencies of opinion and doctrine which they enunciated upon identical or similar questions".

This must have been a Herculean task, and, so far as the reviewer can judge, has been performed in masterly fashion. The various prize court tribunals, so Professor Garner tells us in his introduction, rendered no less than fifteen hundred reported decisions which deal "with every question of international law that has been the subject of adjudication by the Prize Courts during former wars and in many cases old questions were presented under new and sometimes novel forms. Likewise, the Prize Courts were called upon to decide many new questions that had never before been the subject of adjudication, and consequently concerning which there were no exact precedents for the guidance of the courts". The greater number of important decisions are of course British (including colonial), but the author was able to study and digest about 400 French decisions, 240 Italian, about 250 German, 246 Austro-Hungarian, 22 Belgian, 15 Chinese, 4 Japanese, and 2 decisions rendered by the Prize Court of Siam.

If one were to try to convey any adequate notion of the scope and content of these decisions, he would have to list the 493 section-headings into which the 17 chapters of the work are divided. But one is able to get some idea of the content by noting the following chapter-headings: Function and Organization of Prize Courts; Jurisdiction of Prize Courts; Prize Court Procedure; Law applied by the Prize Court; Right of Capture in Maritime War; Capture of Enemy Private Property at Sea—the Declaration of Paris; Nationality of Ships; Nationality of Goods Captured at Sea—Enemy Character; Contraband of War; Blockade; and Indemnities and Damages.

In a review of the book it is of course impossible to touch upon more than a few of the important topics discussed.

In respect to prize court procedure it is worth noting that "an important change in British Prize Court procedure, introduced by the Prize Court rules of 1914, was the abolition of the old rule that captors must prove their case from the ship's papers and from the 'standing interrogatories' and the substitution of a new rule permitting with the consent of the Court the introduction at the first hearing of extrinsic evidence, oral or documentary, which might be material to the issue" (sec. 86, pp. 114–115. Cf. sec. 5, pp. 397 ff.). This is a change involving far-reaching possibilities or consequences.

It is reassuring to note that "all the Prize Courts which were called upon to decide questions involving the application of the Declaration of Paris recognized its prescriptions as constituting an established part of international law and therefore binding upon them"; but it is less reassuring to be told that "while the Prize Courts regarded the Declaration of Paris as a binding international act, they generally interpreted its provisions in a very strict sense and occasionally refused to accord claimants the benefits of the Declaration when, if a more liberal interpretation had been placed upon it, their goods would have escaped condemnation. Moreover, by means of reprisals measures adopted by some of the bellig-

erents in 1915, the provisions of the Declaration were seriously infringed upon, if not disregarded" (pp. 145-146).

It is also gratifying to learn that, generally speaking, belligerent governments did not take advantage of the so-called "solidarity" or "general participations" clause of the Hague Conventions of 1907 (which rendered them technically not binding), but usually enforced them as declaratory of existing international law (pp. 147 and 150 ff.; for the attitude of the prize courts toward the Declaration of London, see secs. 113 ff., pp. 159 ff.).

One of the darkest subjects most needing the illumination of knowledge is the relation between international and municipal law. Thanks to Professor Garner, we now have some notion of the views of German, French, and Italian jurists on this important subject (secs. 133-136). Particularly illuminating is his discussion of the very important *Zamora* Case (secs. 130-132).

There are many other subjects, particularly relating to the law of contraband, continuous voyage, blockade, and unneutral service, upon which this digest of prize court decisions during the World War throws valuable light. In view of the exigencies of space we shall have to content ourselves with the samples already given.

AMOS S. HERSHEY.

*The Russian Revolution, 1917-1926.* By LANCELOT LAWTON.  
(London: Macmillan. 1927. Pp. x, 524. 21 s.)

AMONG all the books on Russia that have appeared during the last decade, the volume in hand is one of the most interesting and least trustworthy, combining as it does a series of vivid personal sketches with an unsuccessful attempt at a general history of ten years of revolution and reconstruction. Refusing to accept the responsibility for any systematic discussion of the economic, social, and political conditions antecedent to the Revolution, and failing also to give an adequate account of the mass-movement of 1917 (although he says that the masses "took their own course", p. 35), the author leaves the causes and the earlier processes of the Revolution in obscurity.

The peasants are referred to as "small proprietors" before the Revolution (p. 435), and "small holders" after (p. 83). As a matter of fact the large majority of them were and are members of land-holding communes, and such terms as "small holder" can not be applied to them without very careful qualification. Again, if the word "possession" means ownership, it is not true that "when the Revolution came nearly 90 per cent. of the arable surface of European Russia was in the possession" of the peasants, whether small proprietors or not (p. 435). Again, it is misleading to say in general terms that the revolutionary redistribution did not add appreciably to the peasants' holdings (p. 83); by 1920 the holdings of this class as a whole had been augmented by about one-

fourth, while those of the poorer peasants had been increased in much larger proportion, because of the fact that they received land, not only from the non-peasant proprietors, but also from their richer neighbors of the peasant class.

The data in regard to the ownership of the means of production (pp. 457-458) are inextricably confused, while the author's estimates of industrial wages (p. 423) can have no basis in the statistics of the subject. Russian manufactures have always been short in quantity, imperfect in quality, and high in price, and these conditions, magnified since the Revolution, have had an important effect upon the relations between the peasantry on the one hand, and the industrial workers and the government on the other. To this point, the author gives a quite sufficient emphasis.

Of intemperate and unjustified superlatives, there is a handsome showing, as, for example, these statements: that "the greater part of the younger generation has been irretrievably ruined" (p. 230); that "at least 60 per cent. of the town population" is suffering from tuberculosis (p. 277); that the "whole nation" is stricken with syphilis (p. 238).

Any attempt to present here an exhaustive syllabus of errors must fail for lack of space, but it should be noted as a major shortcoming that the author refers only occasionally to his sources of information, and very rarely with sufficient explicitness to permit of easy verification.

Details aside, it may be said that Mr. Lawton gives a satisfactory popular account of the issues raised by the "Opposition" within the Communist Party, the economic situation of the old middle class, the effect upon them of the terror, the procedure of the courts, the status of the Church, and the rise of a "proletarian literature". But the author is at his best when he records his own personal observations and experiences. Although he was last in Russia in 1924, his traveller's impressions are usually set down in the present tense; and then, too, the assessment of his more formal chapters has shown him to be not without prejudice. Nevertheless, he has caught something of the flavor and color of Russian life, and when due allowance has been made as to credibility and chronology his sketches will still have a modest place among the sources for the history of the Revolution.

GEROID TANQUARY ROBINSON.

*A Frenchman Looks at the Peace.* By ALCIDE ÉBRAY, translated by E. W. DICKES. (New York: Knopf. 1927. Pp. xiv, 267. \$4.00.)

THIS book (the French title is *La Paix Malpropre: pour la Réconciliation par la Vérité*) is to some extent the French counterpart of J. M. Keynes's famous volumes, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace* and *A Revision of the Treaty*, for it is a sustained condemnation of the Treaty of Versailles and of French policy since 1919; and it is important chiefly because it is the work of a conservative ex-diplomatist who is the last

person that might be expected to write such a book and who had to publish it in Italy in order to avoid any connection with the Left parties in his own country. There is little that is new in the author's main contentions that the Treaty of Versailles was not consistent with the terms on which Germany surrendered and that the Allies, and more particularly France, failed to abide by their own treaty. Chapter V., however, will be found useful, for M. Ébray discusses in detail the arguments, drawn from the treaty, which successive French governments put forward to justify the policy of sanctions, and refutes them rather successfully. In general, he makes out a good case from a legal point of view. On the other hand, the political aspects of peace-making and post-war diplomacy are hardly considered at all; and while political convenience is no justification for treaty-breaking, criticism of policy without adequate regard for the determining factors accomplishes little. But M. Ébray faces honestly the conclusions to which his logic leads him, and comes out, squarely for a revision of the treaty, at least for Austro-German union and a revision of the reparations clauses; and since this last, from a practical point of view, involves the interallied debts, he urges that the United States be paid by the cession of the French West Indies.

In view of the author's bitter arraignment of M. Poincaré's post-war policy, his judgment on that statesman's attitude in July, 1914, is worth noting. "Perhaps he [M. Poincaré] believed that the prestige of Russia in Europe would be damaged were she to sustain another diplomatic defeat in the Balkans, and that the Franco-Russian Alliance would suffer in consequence. If this were so, he would have been acting very reasonably in dissuading Russia from allowing such a defeat to be inflicted on her, and even in going so far as to promise her the military support of France" (p. 14). M. Ébray's opinion is that "not only responsibility for the war was divided, but that properly speaking there was no 'guilty' party. . . . The war was fatally destined, and everyone did what it was only natural that he should do" (p. xii).

A few slips may be noted. The appointment of Delcassé as ambassador to Russia did not occur "while M. Poincaré was still at the Quai d'Orsay, after his election to the Presidency, but before his departure for the Élysée" (p. 12). It is hardly correct to say that "after July 28 [1914], Germany used every effort to restrain her Ally and to avert a general war" (p. 18): she did not ask Austria to refrain from invading Serbia. The complaint that "the populations of Austria-Hungary and especially the Czechoslovaks and Jugoslavs . . . were not consulted by way of plebiscite", is not fair, for the two latter and also the Hungarians spontaneously established their own governments. The protest against the decision refusing the Vorarlberg permission to join Switzerland ignores the fact that Switzerland herself opposed the union (p. 122), and it is not true that "the pact under which the Entente had secured Austria's capitulation included a formal permission of her union with Germany" (p. 122). M. Ébray rejects the suggestion that in "open covenants,



openly arrived at", "what [Mr. Wilson] meant was simply that the results of the negotiations should not be kept secret" (p. 61)—but Mr. Wilson has said that that was what he did mean. It is surely an exaggeration to say that "the Entente had conquered the Central Empires largely by means of the illegal weapon of starvation" (p. 195).

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

#### BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*A Book of Old Maps, delineating American History from the Earliest Days down to the Close of the Revolutionary War.* Compiled and edited by EMERSON D. FITE, Professor in Vassar College, and ARCHIBALD FREEMAN, Instructor in Phillips Academy. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1926. Pp. xv, 299. \$25.00.)

THE American Institute of Graphic Arts selected this book as one of the fifty best made in the United States for the year ending March, 1927, and awarded the medal of the Institute to its publishers as the trade-edition book of these fifty volumes most distinguished for design and craftsmanship. To its designer was also granted, for the first time it has been offered, the Alfred E. Ommen award of \$100. The reviewer would not think of questioning this award, but a glance at the maps is sufficient to show that design and craftsmanship (here apparently the presswork) have not been equal.

Many of the maps have a messy look. They do not stand out clearly and distinctly and consultation of many of them is not easy and of some almost impossible. The ink on some of the maps rubs off on the finger. One might hazard a guess that the unsatisfactory appearance is due in part to the paper used—a firm superior stock—which is excellent, indeed, for the letterpress, but apparently not at all adequate for map-printing. If one compare these maps with those of another recent work, namely, Humphreys, *Old Decorative Maps* (London and New York, 1926), he will note at once the superior appearance of the latter. The difference is striking and is seemingly due to the superior presswork and to the use of paper better suited for map-printing.

Some of the maps are reduced so greatly that they are of little use, the only benefits one can derive from them being mostly in general form and in the information of the accompanying letterpress. Instances of such maps are the world map (no. 3), the La Cosa (no. 4), the Waldseemüller (no. 8), the Maiollo (no. 12), the Ribero (no. 14), the Cabot (no. 18), the Mitchell (nos. 47 and 74). Of world maps, sections showing the American portion would have been far better, for the smaller reduction would have made possible the reading of names and legends much more nearly than is now the case. The Mitchell map is a great map and might well have been shown in sections and since this work is not an intensive study of maps the revised map (no. 74) should only have been

used. Those maps which have not been excessively reduced are serviceable, but as noted above might have been much more so.

Nowhere are we told the principles guiding the compilers and editors in the choice of maps. There is no preface and no other explanation for the work beyond the scope as shown in the title. The lack of a preface is serious, for the compilers have labored long (about ten years) and faithfully and owed it to themselves as well as to their public to indicate their *modus operandi*.

There are here reproduced some 74 maps, the earliest being the world map of Donnus Nicolaus Germanus (1474) and the latest Renault's plan of Yorktown (published in 1825). Between these two extremes are many maps one would expect to find in such a collection. But one looks in vain for the Cantino, the Canerio, the Ortelius of 1570 (one of the great maps of the century), more maps of the French school of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Popple, of 1733, the Evans, of 1755, and others. Of the Richard King map, probably contemporaneous with the Cantino and Canerio, the compilers seem not to have known. It is a question whether it might not have been more serviceable to have included only maps beginning with the Mitchell map of 1755, and so have made the volume centre about the period when Great Britain became the most prominent nation in North America and of the rise of the new United States. This would have eliminated much of the patchiness that exists throughout the volume.

In their letterpress, certain inaccuracies exist, some of which are here noted. Cantino and Canerio (p. 11) are named as map-makers. The Agnese family is given too prominent a place in the map world. Its members were prolific and artistic map-makers but they continued old errors year after year. The La Cosa map was drawn on parchment, not oxhide, contrary to general opinion. The assumption that the so-called Columbus map (p. 7) was laid down between December, 1488, and March, 1493, because, while it shows Diaz's rounding of the Cape of Good Hope in the former year it does not show the discoveries of Columbus on his first voyage, is made mostly on guess-work and is stated too dogmatically. Likewise the assumption that the Lenox globe was made between 1503 and 1507, or after the letter of Vesputius to Lorenzo de' Medici, and before the publication of the Waldseemüller map, because of the absence of certain information relative to the east coast of North America and of the name "America" from the southern continent, is a guess. It is easy to forget that the sixteenth century was not the twentieth, and that information circulated then more slowly than now. Some have placed the date of this globe much later. There is no real evidence that the so-called Leonardo da Vinci globe (p. 38) was made by that artist. The letter of Maximilianus Transylvanus was published in 1523, not in 1522 (p. 41). The date for Pineda's voyage (1619—p. 48) is of course a misprint. It is "Martin" Basanier, not "Martine" (p. 70). On p. 79, Mercator is spoken of as "a rather uncritical student" and on p. 88 as

the greatest living authority on geographical matters. For the latest discussion (later than this volume) of the Marquette journals (p. 163), see the recent work by Francis Borgia Steck, *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673* (Washington, 1927). The Gulf of California had long appeared on maps as "Mar Bermejo" (Mer Vermeille—p. 163) although the text would make it appear that it was of rather late origin. There were various editions and states of the Mitchell map, the whole story of which it is reported is now being unravelled. The reviewer is not so sure as the compilers that the Mitchell map (no. 74) bears the writing of George III.

Information concerning the later maps and their times is much happier than that concerning the earlier maps, for here the compilers are on surer ground, especially as to the history of the period. That they have not entirely mastered map technic is easily seen, and their bibliography is at times insufficient; thus, the failure to mention the *List of Editions of Ptolemy's Geography* (New York, 1866) by Wilberforce Eames is inexcusable, for this has been of great use; although the bibliographies of Stevens and Winsor are both mentioned. More information concerning the great collections of Ptolemys in the United States is easily obtainable and should have been given. The reviewer must conclude that taken as a whole the letterpress is uneven. Used with discrimination, however, the volume is serviceable to a certain degree. The Agnese map used as a frontispiece and reproduced in colors makes a better appearance than most of the maps.

JAMES A. ROBERTSON.

*Antonio de Mendoza, First Viceroy of New Spain.* By ARTHUR SCOTT AITON, Associate Professor of History in the University of Michigan. (Durham: Duke University Press. 1927. Pp. xii, 240. \$3.50.)

PROFESSOR AITON gives us our first biography of a man who was one of Spain's most distinguished administrators in the age of her greatness, and one of the foremost empire-builders of the sixteenth century. As first viceroy of New Spain, Mendoza completed the work of conquest and organization begun by Hernando Cortés, consolidated Spain's hold upon the mainland of North America, and traced the course of development which colonial institutions were to pursue for more than two centuries. It was his work, pre-eminently, to perpetuate in a new world the monarchical traditions and the aristocratic, manorial régime which characterized the older societies of Europe.

Mendoza's antecedents as a scion of one of the oldest and proudest families of Castile are meticulously set forth in a biographical foreword, followed by a chapter sketching the vicissitudes of government in New Spain up to the viceroy's arrival in 1535. The rest of the volume is devoted to a description of political administration, financial policy, social

and economic interests, geographical exploration, and Indian wars. Considerable space is given to the organization of royal justice, to the regulation of mining enterprise, and to relations with the natives. The monograph is based upon an extended use of manuscript materials in the Archivo de Indias in Seville, and also leans heavily upon the records of the ancient *cabildo* of Mexico City.

The result is a useful and informing volume, and a much needed contribution to the history of Spanish colonial beginnings in the New World. Professor Aiton adds greatly to our knowledge of the Mixton War, and of the later career of Francisco Vásquez de Coronado; and for the first time he puts into its proper setting the *visita general* made by Francisco Tello de Sandoval in 1544-1547. In his own words, it throws a flood of light upon the mechanism of *visitas* in general, and upon Spanish institutional history of the sixteenth century. He shares, however, a biographer's whole-souled admiration for his subject, and is inclined to ascribe everything that was good to the viceroy's initiative or intelligence. The reviewer, for instance, can not altogether follow him in the statement that the "measure of success enjoyed by the great pioneering enterprise which will always bear his [Coronado's] name was not due to his abilities, but to the organizing genius that stood sponsor for him . . ." (p. 128); and he is not wholly convinced by the effort to clear Mendoza of the charge of cruelty to the Indians in the Mixton War (p. 158 n.).

As the writer indicates in his preface, the character of Mendoza's task in America has made the study primarily one of institutions. The reviewer's only wish is that there were more of it. Generalizations about political, social, and religious conditions in New Spain with which we are more or less familiar might be much further developed and illustrated from the wealth of material that must exist in the Seville archives. We should like to have something concrete about the important matter of relations between the viceroy and the "subordinate" audiencias of Guatemala, Santo Domingo, and Nueva Galicia, and about the Mexican end of commercial relations with the metropolis. That the audiencia established in New Spain in 1528 was clothed with greater powers than the one set up in Santo Domingo (p. 18) is extremely doubtful, and more so is the statement that the former by law possessed in Mendoza's time two *fiscales* or prosecuting attorneys (p. 62<sup>1</sup>). And the fact that a *sala del crimen* was not introduced until 1577 is sufficient proof that the audiencia did *not* acquire under Mendoza the composition characteristic of it during the viceregal period (*ibid.*). The paragraph on page 67 concerning the *cabildo* likewise requires considerable emendation, while the charge that Mendoza aimed to make his office hereditary is certainly not substantiated by the evidence adduced in the text. It is, moreover, scarcely accurate to speak of the "New Empire of the Mayas" as offering resistance to Span-

<sup>1</sup> A foot-note which makes reference to Bancroft, *History of Mexico*, II. 325, involves two inaccuracies: (1) the page is 328, and (2) the reference says that Fuenleal petitioned for only one *fiscal*, not for two as stated in the text.

ish invasion. The last vestiges of that empire had disappeared at least a century before.

Lack of precision in the statement of fact, and awkward repetitions, are probably what serve to distract the mind of the reader. The writer fails in that difficult achievement, a fair balance between the body of the text and the foot-notes. Much of the material in the latter might better have served to lend clarity and color to the narrative. It is annoying to read the categorical statement that a hundred thousand Indian warriors had assembled on the *peñol* of Mixton (p. 156), and then to learn in the middle of a foot-note that "undoubtedly the number given above . . . is an exaggeration"; or to be told that three judges of the *audiencia* of Nueva Galicia arrived in Mexico in July of 1549 (p. 181), but below in a foot-note that one of the three had arrived in 1548 and awaited the coming of his colleagues.

The reviewer sounds splenetic. He is not—it is the virtues of the volume before him that inspire him to call upon the author for another, a better, and a bigger book on the subject.

*Francis Drake and Other Early Explorers along the Pacific Coast.*

By JOHN W. ROBERTSON. (San Francisco: Grabhorn Press. 1927. Pp. 290. \$15.00.)

THIS book, as a product of the printer's art, ranks very high among the year's publications. Paper, typography, illustrations, binding are all of the first order of excellence. There are reproductions of twenty-eight maps, many of them very rare and some which had remained until now unpublished. Other illustrations represent a beautiful portrait of Sir Francis Drake, and the Bodleian Library chair made from oak timber out of the ribs of the *Golden Hinde*.

The text contains three papers which may be regarded as introductory (84 pages) to the main theme. They are Cortes, the Discoverer, Indians of the Californias, and Jesuit Survey of California. The story of Drake is presented not as a straightforward narrative but in the form of a discussion of a series of controverted points about his voyage and particularly his landfall on the California coast. It illustrates the art of history-making by argumentative means in the absence of an adequate body of ascertained facts. Drake's log-book and the colored drawings he is known to have executed being lost, historians have been forced to rely upon a Hakluyt narrative of the voyage, of which the source is unknown, *The World Encompassed*, a narrative based on the diary of Francis Fletcher, Drake's chaplain, declarations of John Drake the navigator's nephew, and the testimony of certain Spaniards captured by Drake and afterwards released. With reference to the nothing attained and the landfall, the sources are limited to the first three, all of which are vague and inconclusive. They have been interpreted to signify that Drake ran as high as 48° N. lat. or even to the border of Alaska; and, also, that he

reached no higher latitude than 42° or at most 43°. Some hold that he landed and refitted his ship at Drake's Bay—so called; others contend for Bodega Bay; still others for the modern bay of San Francisco. Wherever Drake may have landed, he penetrated to the interior of the country, established a post, was worshipped by the natives, and took possession of the territory in the name of Queen Elizabeth, applying to the region the name New England (Nova Albion) which in the next generation was bestowed upon the northeastern seaboard of the United States.

The author believes that Drake sailed as far north as latitude 48° or 49°. He also is convinced that the elaborate argument of Professor George Davidson, in favor of a landing on the shore of Drake's Bay, is fallacious. In one aspect the book may be regarded as primarily an attack upon the findings of Davidson. In his capacity of destructive critic Doctor Robertson lays about him right valiantly and to the reader who is unfamiliar with the nice points of the geography near latitude 38°, it seems as if he has deprived the distinguished Coast Survey expert of much of his old-time authority. On the other hand, neither the question regarding Drake's "farthest north" nor that concerning his landfall is settled by him: in fact, with reference to the second point, no theory is advanced by the author who, nevertheless, appears to show some bias in favor of the present San Francisco Bay.

The discussion throughout is involved, the arrangement is bad, and there is an excessive amount of repetition. A few textual errors were noted. The author however evinces much familiarity with sources including maps, and he has a penetrating insight into many of the problems involved in their interpretation.

It is believed the book will prove especially valuable as a collection of excerpts from rare and somewhat inaccessible sources.

JOSEPH SCHAFER.

*Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments respecting North America.* Edited by LEO FRANCIS STOCK. Volume II., 1689–1702. (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1927. Pp. xvi, 564. Paper, \$4.00; cloth, \$5.00.)

THAT the second volume of *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments respecting North America* adds but little to what is already known of the activities of the English, Scottish, and Irish parliaments, in the fourteen years between 1689 and 1702, is in no way the fault of the skilled and conscientious editor. Dr. Stock has been able to discover but few reports of debates and proceedings other than those contained in the printed journals. The hitherto unprinted matter in this volume "consists of several petitions from the Manuscripts of the House of Lords; accounts of the Hudson's Bay Company controversy of 1698, taken from the Memorial Book of that company; and the report, covering nineteen pages, of the debate of December 6, 1699, concerning pirates and Bello-



mont's relations with Kidd, from the Hardwicke Papers in the New York Public Library". In addition there have been found a few additional details of proceedings in the parliaments of Scotland relating to the Darien Company, and a few reports of debates in the English Parliament, transmitted home by the French ambassador, which are preserved in the Archives des Affaires Étrangères at Paris. The total number of pages occupied by this new material is not large. The bulk of the volume is already familiar to scholars who have had the courage to go through the printed records.

Despite the statement by the editor that the present volume shows a "growing interference of Parliament in colonial affairs", I do not think that the extracts here printed bear out this contention or show any particular interest on the part of Parliament in the colonies as such. Parliament was concerned almost solely with the state of the trade in all its varied aspects. It considered revenue, customs duties, balance of trade, exports and imports, the shipping of corn out of the country, and the interpretation and enforcement of the navigation acts, particularly in the matter of foreign-built ships taken as prize. The only instance in which it took a share in the writing of a governor's instructions was when it addressed the king regarding an additional instruction to be sent to the governors "to make the trade of this kingdom more beneficial" (pp. 204-207). Under its eye came the Royal African Company, the Hudson's Bay Company, the Darien Company, the Newfoundland Fishery, the Greenland Fishery, wool, naval stores, and piracy, each of which was dealt with eventually in an act of Parliament. It also debated the registration of servants, interlopers, and, because the time was one of war, the navy, defense, captures, prizes, convoys, and the losses, value, and tonnage of ships. But one feels, in reading the volume, that the activities of Parliament in regard to the colonies were trifling as compared with those of the executive side of the government. In these debates Parliament seems very remote from the plantations and its members seem to have very little information about the colonies or interest in their administration. Indeed, a more impressive study could be made of the things that Parliament left undone than of those that it actually accomplished.

Dr. Stock has interpreted his subject liberally and generally has excellent reasons for the material that he has selected. Statements in the preface call for a few comments. The Board of Trade, which Dr. Stock in the body of the work calls too often the "Council of Trade", did not make annual reports to Parliament. Properly speaking, it reported only to the king, that is, to the Privy Council, but it did make reports to the House of Lords or to the House of Commons, when ordered to do so, and these reports, of which there are a dozen or more here entered, are among the most valuable of the texts. The number of the crew required to be English-born under the Navigation Acts was three-quarters not two-thirds. Oddly enough Dr. Stock has the fraction right in his notes. I can not agree that the policy of bringing the private colonies under the

direct control of the crown was "a policy of the later Stuarts". It arose out of the exigencies of England's commercial development and was just as much a part of England's purpose after 1689 as it was before. It was, indeed, more Hanoverian than it was Stuart, for though it originated with the Lords of Trade, it was continued with accelerated momentum as a policy of the Board of Trade for more than half a century. It was based not on any Stuart precedent, but "upon the general reason that no power in the plantations should be independent of England" (p. 414). Nor was it part of an "imperial policy", for it was at bottom not imperial at all, but purely mercantilistic, which was quite a different matter. The bills of 1701 and 1706, neither of which belongs to the time of the later Stuarts but to the days of William III. and Queen Anne, did more than "permit" the charters to be surrendered; they *required* them to be surrendered. I am surprised that the editor, in his notes, has nowhere referred to Osgood's volumes, for there he would have found a much better treatment of certain subjects than in the volumes that he has consulted.<sup>1</sup> A note on the claim of William, Earl of Kinnoull, to "Barbadoes and the Caribbee Islands" would have been helpful, for I doubt if there are many readers of this volume who are likely to know why in 1702 the earl's son was entitled (or said he was entitled) to £1000 per annum, payable out of the four and a half per cent. export duty (p. 453).

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and the West Indies, July, 1712-July, 1714, preserved in the Public Record Office.* Edited by CECIL HEADLAM, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. (London: Stationery Office. 1926. Pp. xxiii, 461. £1 12s. 6d.)

THE new volume of the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, covers the period from July, 1712, to July, 1714, the death of Queen Anne, and brings to light much that is interesting in the history of the colonial relationship with England and the development of America's own institutions. Most important of all are the troubles constantly arising between governor and assembly and council and assembly over the question of the prerogative, not only in Virginia and New York—already well known from the documents among the Spotswood papers and in the New York collection—but also in Jamaica and Barbados and, to a lesser extent, in Bermuda. In defiance of the queen's constitutional powers, the assemblies very generally were claiming the right to adjourn themselves (pp. 321, 360, Jamaica; p. 109, New York), to decide as to the qualifications of elector and elected (p. 375, Jamaica), to bound and divide counties and parishes (pp. 235, 303, Virginia), to choose their own agents and to elect committees of correspondence (p. 238, Barbados; p. 86, New York), to control land grants (p. 135, Virginia), and, in general, to enjoy the same privileges as those of Parliament (sects. 348, 352, Jamaica and "the other

<sup>1</sup> Osgood's volumes were constantly consulted. Ed.

plantations also"), "for which we cannot find the least grounds", said the Board of Trade. On the financial side appear the questions of taxation (p. 70, Virginia; sects. 122, 293, 293 I., 362, New York), excise (sect. 45, Jamaica; sect. 180, Barbados), the right of the council to amend money bills (sects. 7, 122, New York; sects. 45, 412, Jamaica), and, in general, the power of the crown to dispose of the public funds. Closely bound up with this phase of the conflict was the refusal of Jamaica to grant a perpetual revenue, an incident in the struggle that led to the passing of the act of 1728, the attempts of Barbados for many years to obtain the use of the four and a half per cent. for herself, and the unwillingness among the colonies generally that money arising from quit-rents, whales, escheats, and forfeitures should go to England and be controlled by the Treasury.

The trouble at this time may have been due, in part at least, to poverty and the scarcity of money in the colonies. Trade throughout the West Indies was at a standstill (p. 333); the price of tobacco was low and we have here (pp. 236, 237, Virginia; pp. 7, 292, Maryland) an early phase of the agitation which led to the attempt in 1733 to obtain a reduction of the duty in England; there was a great dearth of coin in Bermuda (sect. 540); there were evidences of poverty in Jamaica (p. 147); of New England Dudley could say that "all the coyn and bullion passing in trade [were] not enô to pay the necessary expenses of the year" (p. 254); and the postmaster general made the situation more difficult by demanding sterling money for postage (sect. 340 I.).

But the main cause was not financial; it was the determination of the colonies to secure self-government, and to resist, at all costs, the interference of the prerogative in their affairs. The process of reducing the royal authority and influence in America, as they had been reduced in England, was already under way. The assembly in New York was denying the right of the governor to erect a court of equity (pp. 168, 170); that in Massachusetts was refusing to allow the lieutenant governor to vote in council, because not "choose by the Assembly, at their yearly election, to be one of the Council", and so were denying, as Tailer said, "a parogative belonging to the Crowne" (p. 116); there and elsewhere, particularly in Pennsylvania, where the absurdity of the charter arrangements for the transmission of laws to England is well brought out (sect. 434, pp. 271, 288), the assemblies were passing temporary laws and so evading the royal right of disallowance (p. 352), and were insisting that an "ancient practice" (pp. 135, 236), a local custom (pp. 135-136), a colonial statute (pp. 135, 234), or a charter (pp. 116, 206) were more binding than a royal instruction. Spotswood said truly that they were trying "to abridge the Crown" and he added, somewhat wearily, that even when he yielded a point (in order not "to sow their temper") they accepted the favor, not as a "gracious concession of the sovereign" but as an inherent right. The Board of Trade, with the aid of the attorney general, contested every inch of the ground (sects. 348, 352, 427, 701, p. 208), up-

holding the governors in the attempt "to support the Queen's prerogative". Orkney understood the situation very well when he remarked in 1714 that the prerogative had been "very much attacked of late" (sect. 703), and Lieutenant Governor Moody wanted the queen's "prerogative and authority fixed" in Newfoundland "in a stronger manner . . . than they are in our old settlements" (sect. 707). Thus the issue was fairly joined even at this early date.

In view of this decline of the power of the prerogative, it is not surprising that the English authorities should have turned to Parliament for aid. The Board of Trade determined to check the assumption by the colonies of "pretended rights\* tending to an independency on the Crown of Great Britain" and to deter "the other plantations from attempting the like" (p. 168). It threatened New York (sects. 313, 324, 409, 549), Virginia (p. 172), and all the private plantations (sect. 728) with the intervention of Parliament, if they continued to flout the prerogative and to evade the acts of trade. These threats rarely came to anything, and one of the difficult problems of the period which has never been satisfactorily solved is why Parliament so persistently refused to support the board in its efforts to maintain the dignity of the crown in America.

While resisting the queen's authority, the councilmen and assemblymen were shaping in some small measure ideas that were more distinctly American. They were laying down their own definition of the suffrage, based on the right of every man possessing the proper qualifications to vote (p. 305), and they were so far interested in the question of office-holding as to raise some doubts of the powers and tenure of one holding by commission from the crown. This appears as yet but vaguely, though the fact that Spotswood and Hunter took pains to emphasize the source of their authority (p. 305, sect. 362), and the further fact of a long controversy, here recorded, over the status of a patent officer both point in the same direction. Rigby (Jamaica), Skene, Lewis, Forbes (Barbados), and Lawrence (Maryland) were involved in the discussion and the evidence discloses manifest discontent that patent officers should be allowed (sect. 111) to hold more than one office at a time and to reside in England, while naval officers and customs officials had to reside in the colonies. The movement in behalf of a new idea of office-holding had, however, obtained but little momentum at this time. It attained greater headway in the period before the Revolution.

We have in this volume evidence foreshadowing the Molasses Act (sects. 482, 577, 589), when a bill was offered to Parliament to prohibit trade with Surinam and other foreign plantations. We have indications of the evasion of the plantation duty by the New Englanders in Newfoundland waters (sect. 614); strong expressions of opinion by Archibald Cumings, in 1714, that Newfoundland should become a colony like the others (p. 244), and by Captain Taverner of the need of strengthening the fishery in the face of the coming peace-time rivalry with France (sect. 614). We read much about the naval war in the West Indies and New-

foundland; of the project of a settlement in the region east of Sagadahoc, in which Thomas Coram was interested; of 119 undischarged plantation bonds in Antigua alone (pp. 163, 173 I., II.); of the sending of prisoners to England for trial "with full proofs of their guilt" (sects. 49, 50, 62); of appeals from chancery courts (sects. 29, 397, p. 210); of the plan for reuniting the Northern Neck to the colony of Virginia (sect. 240 I.); of smuggling off Newfoundland (sect. 110); and of Nicholson's commission to make a general inquiry into the affairs of the colonies (sects. 97, 154, 259, 264, 267 II., 301, 612).

The volume is well edited, but no references are given to documents previously printed. All the letters from Hunter, Spotswood, and the North Carolina governors, except four (sects. 18, 123, 124, 295), have appeared elsewhere. In the index, "Hunching" should be "Hunking" (p. 408).

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*The Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826.* By DEXTER PERKINS, Watson Professor of History in the University of Rochester. [Harvard Historical Studies, volume XXIX.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1927. Pp. xi, 280. \$3.50.)

IN confining his study of the Monroe Doctrine to a period of less than four years Professor Perkins has avoided the complication of interpretations placed upon it in conditions, political and international, other than those for which it was framed. He gives a remarkably full and clear statement of the two principles involved, the one on the Northwest boundary controversy leading to the non-colonization principle, and the other arising from the Spanish-American situation leading to the warning to European governments against interference by force with South America. The principle of non-colonization was, in Mr. Perkins's opinion, almost exclusively due to John Quincy Adams (p. 8), and the warning to Europe was strongly influenced by Adams, while the republicanism of the doctrine is given to Monroe (p. 101). The result of his careful examination of the origin of the doctrine leads him to conclude that the "personal element" is diminished and that the Monroe Doctrine derives its power and authority "neither from the name of Monroe, nor from the labors of Adams", but from the fact that it "expressed what many men, great and humble, had thought, were thinking then, and were to think in the future". In its breadth of judgment and extent of research Mr. Perkins's study deserves a high place in our diplomatic history. After giving the origin of the doctrine he turns to the question, what Europe, acting in its Holy Alliance, really intended in 1823, and finds that there existed a clear hostility to American institutions—the republican spirit—though the danger of intervention in the affairs of the late Spanish colonies was never really serious. In seeking for a policy Europe ignored the United States and awakened the suspicions of Canning, causing his

advances through Rush for a possible co-operation of Great Britain and the United States. The moral influence of the United States was recognized, and because of it Continental Europe could not but regard an understanding between the United States and England as dangerous to its interests. Great Britain did not pursue her approaches to the United States, nor did she join with Europe in its South American policy. The Monroe Doctrine produced an effect in Europe "of the most transient and unimportant nature" (p. 255). Nor did it have much weight in South America, for, in the event, the Spanish colonies looked for aid and connections in England, rather than to the United States. Mr. Perkins takes each European country in turn and shows what conditions favored this indifference to the doctrine. In his presentation of the results of his research he throws much light on the commerce and politics of the day and suggests much that is new and important—such as the move of France to secure the recognition of the South American States rather than a support to the pretensions of their former ruler. He supplements this European summary by an interesting statement of the manner in which Congress received the President's message. His conclusion is that in its immediate results the message of 1823 was "close to a futility", but it became in later years "an American Shibboleth, powerful in its appeal, and far reaching in its influence". Altogether Mr. Perkins has given a model in historical research and interpretation.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

*Trumpets of Jubilee.* By CONSTANCE MAYFIELD ROURKE. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company. 1927. Pp. xiv, 445. \$5.00.)

UNDER this fascinating but elusive title we are offered a new series of popular biographical studies, dealing with the three notable members of the Beecher family and their contemporaries, Greeley and Barnum. The opening sketch of Lyman Beecher furnishes a background of the early social forces which in many ways conditioned developments during the 'forties, 'fifties, and 'sixties when the other four figures commanded the attention of the American public. Lyman Beecher, dreamy New England plough-boy, who at Yale, in the impassioned Puritan fundamentalism of President Dwight, found inspiration for a great future in the ministry, became for his many friends and enemies, his three wives, and eleven children, a stormy petrel upon life's seas. Under the zealous ministrations of this leader, the new Puritanism threatened to outdo the old. A bundle of physical and nervous energy, Lyman Beecher sought relaxation from the sobriety he preached, at first in various physical feats and later in the demands of a strenuous career. Paradoxically, he never outgrew a passion for his fiddle, while in his early years he would dance a jig and other steps with the greatest relish.



In tragic style, this giant battled the currents of his day, only to see them triumph and draw him in their wake. The "standing order" of Connecticut, which he defended, was swept away by the popular tide and he had to acknowledge the wisdom of its destruction. He tried in vain to check the human flood that was draining the populace of New England into the valley of the Mississippi; yet at nearly threescore years he proclaimed that the moral destiny of the nation and the world's hopes were dependent upon the character of the West itself. Soon, indeed, he cast his lot in with the new favored land and sought there to herald the millennium. At Lane Seminary he stood in the way of a frank discussion of the slavery question and saw his student body and his faculty drop away from his leadership. Six weeks after the exodus of students, Beecher, apostle of Calvinistic fundamentalism, was formally charged with heresy; though acquitted in two ecclesiastical trials, he saw about him in strewn wreckage the labors of a lifetime. A new order of faith was surging about him; at one and the same time he tried to catch its momentum and to cling to the old as well.

In many ways this vigorous personality asserted itself most successfully through his brood of famous children who lived for years under the awful shadow of the Calvinistic doom that he heralded. Seven sons he martialled into the ministry; his most capable daughter became the life-partner of a sober preacher-teacher. In many ways he closely conditioned all their lives. Harriet struggled to throw off the shackles of uncompromising orthodoxy, only to find that her matrimonial ties to Calvin Stowe made the conflict even more difficult. A dutiful wife and a busy mother of seven, she found little opportunity for self-expression until suddenly there flowed from her soul the stirring protest of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Harriet Beecher Stowe had at length found herself; henceforth she was mistress of her own destiny, Lyman Beecher and Calvin Stowe and their brand of Puritanism to the contrary notwithstanding.

The insistent planning of a determined father produced the peerless preacher, Henry Ward Beecher. When he seemed to have turned his back upon the ministry for journalism, he was promptly recalled to his line of duty. Thus diffidently the young preacher went to his task, taking a young New England bride to an Indiana village and living an easy-going life in poverty and squalor. Removal to an Indianapolis charge brought little improvement until the forest camp-meeting challenged his best efforts to arouse the expectant, plastic crowd and he came to revel in his successes. His triumphant revivalism led immediately to the call in 1847 to Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, where he achieved his pre-eminence as a pulpiteer. His sedate congregation looked askance at the crude Westerner, but the flood of his oratory, his quick humor, and his friendliness disarmed criticism. Success was immediate; fabulous financial returns came in; Beecher became globe-trotter, a collector of paintings, bronzes, books, and precious stones. A great apologist of art, he offended many of the sober reformers of his day; he took up the anti-

slavery cause, but not as an abolitionist; he refused to support the extremes of the women's cause. In these several ways he laid the foundations for the attacks upon him, which, after a notable Civil War career and despite his continued success as a writer and lecturer, finally wore him out. A true son of Lyman Beecher, he made a vigorous stand on every issue and lent color and interest to the social life of his day.

Not content with giving us a Beecher trilogy, the author adds, with feebler pen, studies of Horace Greeley, the colorful editor and reformer, and of P. T. Barnum, Prince of Humbug. Greeley, premier spokesman of the Whig party, that stronghold of property, order, and stability, paradoxically combined a devotion to tariff protection and to practical politics with an enthusiasm for Fourierism, feminism, agrarianism, and other Utopian reforms. Barnum is pictured as a born anti-Puritan and self-appointed apostle of freedom who soon became absorbed in the fine art of bally-hoo.

All these sketches conform more or less to the new style of popular psycho-analytical biography, though there is little that is new in the way of either material or emphasis. The popular biographer, however, seldom reveals so deep an interest in and grasp of the general background of forces which furnish the setting for his characters. In this case Miss Rourke penetrates the social history of the middle period of the nineteenth century with interesting glimpses at many of the prevailing forces. The book is well written though it is not always especially easy reading.

ARTHUR C. COLE.

*Constitutional Problems under Lincoln.* By JAMES G. RANDALL, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History in the University of Illinois. (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1926. Pp. xviii, 580. \$4.00.)

THIS may be considered the first book to deal exclusively and comprehensively with the subject indicated by the title, although perhaps a score of competent minds have dealt with portions of it, and with phases considered in connection with related topics. The subject thus isolated justifies itself, because of the importance of the Civil War as the first great test of a modern democracy confronted with the problem of serious war, and because of the increasing importance and significance of Lincoln. The author makes these points central in his treatment. The Constitution and its law are treated as part of the life of the times, with an attempt to assess their weight as compared with political, social, and economic factors. It well illustrates what should be expected of the historian in dealing with a special field, as compared with an historical account written by a specialist in the field.

Such expectation, of course, includes that the historian master the technical parts in such a way as to gain the confidence of those expert in it, and also master its relationships. Mr. Randall has plainly met these

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXIII.—28.

standards. He has not only familiarized himself with all the recognized legal sources and authorities, but has pressed his researches into those types of legal records which are not printed, and has pushed back his controversies to the prenatal influence of Cabinet discussion, diary, and correspondence. His study, begun in the graduate school, has ripened for fifteen years, and will receive the respect of the legal profession, as well as of his own. His authorities are indicated by ample foot-notes, and a bibliography, selected and critical.

The presentation is remarkably lucid; to the point that the book may well be used for reference work in ordinary classes, or as a part text-book. The problems are well set in the introduction. The problems of each chapter are again presented against their historical background, their handling is then discussed, and the results summarized. Four chapters deal with civil war and treason, three with the problem of the *habeas corpus*, one with indemnity of federal officers, one with martial law in the South, one with conscription, three with confiscation, two with emancipation, one with state and federal relations, one with West Virginia, and one with the press.

Mr. Randall has not sought sensation, and his divergences from views previously accepted are not emphasized; nor indeed are they numerous. His contribution is in the unity of his subject and his re-examination of problems in the light of new material. The question of secession he regards as political. His treatment is so brief that it may perhaps be excused for overlooking what to the majority of Southerners was the practical difference between secession and revolution: that the former being legal would be peaceful. He clearly points out the dual legal theory of the North, that the war must be conducted as with a belligerent, but that the Southerners were rebels, and he shows how the conception of treason was modified by increasing the number of those guilty, and moderating the penalties. The question of the constitutional right of Congress or the President to suspend the *habeas corpus* he regards as unsettled, but the scope of martial law as modified by the post-war court decisions. The Indemnity Act he considers as an unsatisfactory piece of war legislation, and the confiscation acts as stretching very far the then existing idea of belligerent powers and as opening the door to maladministration, but, as was the case with most of the extreme measures of the period, much modified by lenity in execution. Conscription he regards as constitutional. The method pursued in emancipation he regards as less satisfactory than that desired by Lincoln, and he brings out some interesting facts with regard to J. Q. Adams's much quoted anticipation of emancipation under the war power. He justly emphasizes the important part played by the states, and he unqualifiedly disapproves of the partition of Virginia. In the case of the press he brings out the interesting contrast, that legal process was much more disregarded in the Civil War than in the World War, but public speech much less controlled. In general he emphasizes the fact that Lincoln's conception of the executive

power was very broad, and his exercise of it very moderate. The fact that the Constitution passed through the ordeal so little affected he attributes not so much to the courts and the constitutional balance of power as to the legal-mindedness of the American people.

In his conclusions Mr. Randall contrasts the exercise of executive powers by Lincoln with the fact that in the World War Wilson's great powers were for the most part granted him by Congress. It might have been well to have modified slightly the contrast by dealing with the Congressional grants to Lincoln of power over industry in the North, as in the case of railroads.

It is plain that no amount of research is sufficient to fit one for dealing with a subject of such a character as this. It was the good fortune of the reviewer to read this volume in manuscript two years ago, and on rereading it, he feels more forcibly than before that Mr. Randall shows not only the necessary technic, but also a quality of mastery, which will give his treatment such finality as one may expect from mortal historians.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

*Roosevelt and the Caribbean.* By HOWARD C. HILL, Ph.D., of the University of Chicago. (Chicago: University Press. 1927. Pp. xii, 233. \$2.50.)

THIS monograph on one phase of the foreign policy of President Roosevelt is valuable more in the material presented and the problems raised than in the opinions and conclusions of the author. It is evident that he has had access to important sources of historical information, notably the collection of Roosevelt Papers now deposited in the Library of Congress. Dr. Hill has been a most conscientious investigator. Where he fails, in my opinion, is in his method of analysis and inference. In common with a good many historical writers he is too inclined to attach literal significance to the *littera scripta*, and too little significance to what is not on record. For example, in his treatment of the naval demonstration by Germany and Great Britain against Venezuela in 1902-1903 Dr. Hill is much perturbed over Roosevelt's own account of his efforts to guard against the possibility of German imperialism in the Caribbean, because there is no corroboration of his warnings to the German ambassador to be found in the German archives. Roosevelt's memory of this diplomatic crisis may have been faulty, but there would appear to be no valid ground for questioning the nature of his personal intervention or of the reasons for such action in a matter of such grave significance.

In his treatment of the Taking of Panama, Dr. Hill is unduly impressed by the documentary presentation of the case of Colombia, which naturally ignores the exigencies of partizan politics in that country, as well as the large aspects of the great problem of the right of construction of a canal across this international highway. Roosevelt's unfortunate phrase—"I took the Canal Zone"—apparently means to Dr. Hill the confession

of a highway bandit rather than a jocose epitome of a complicated legal and diplomatic argument which he could not possibly set forth in a popular speech in the midst of strenuous festivities in honor of the President at Berkeley, California, March 11, 1911.

The author is much more generous in his appreciation of the practical idealism which characterized Roosevelt's policy concerning the Collection of Debts in Santo Domingo, and Mediation in Central America. Nevertheless, he can not forbear certain attenuated animadversions on the subject of Rooseveltian Imperialism. "Roosevelt's policy does not seem to have been influenced to any marked degree by a desire to stimulate the economic penetration of the Caribbean by American business men and American corporations" (p. 211). "It should be added also that Roosevelt numbered among his advisers and associates both in the Cabinet and in the diplomatic service men like Bacon and Meyer who in days past had had close connections with powerful financial interests in New York City." But for all the actions and relationships mentioned above political rather than economic considerations seem to have determined Roosevelt's course. That Roosevelt was influenced in his Caribbean policy by the economic tendencies of his day is of course beyond question, but no evidence has been found to support the thesis that either his measures or his actions were determined by, or were the result of, economic considerations pressed upon him by American "financiers, business men, and corporations" (p. 212). In conclusion Dr. Hill says: "In his course of action Roosevelt ever held in the foreground the needs of national defense. In his relations with the backward peoples of the tropics, with the exception of Colombia, his attitude was paternalistic, his policy that of benevolent imperialism" (p. 213).

We are in great need of a new definition of imperialism as employed by Dr. Hill and a good many other recent writers, to whom it apparently connotes any vigorous action by a nation to secure full and immediate respect for the rights of its citizens and of its essential interests under international law. They would not seem to draw any clear-cut distinction between the policy of aggrandizement followed by some European powers in Africa and the policy of "benevolent imperialism" followed by the United States in the fulfilment of its obligations under the Monroe Doctrine, or in the simple protection of American rights.

PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN.

*Immigration Restriction.* By ROY L. GARIS, Associate Professor of Economics in Vanderbilt University. (New York: Macmillan. 1927. Pp. xvi, 376. \$4.00.)

THE lag between public opinion and legislation, even in the most democratic of countries, has long been noted by students of political affairs. The United States doubtless furnishes many illustrations of this truth, but perhaps none more striking than that afforded by the history

of the immigration law. A comprehensive study of the development of this law and of the public attitudes that have actuated it is therefore of direct interest not only to those who are primarily concerned with immigration itself, but to all who approach the study of social control from any angle whatsoever.

Such a study is now available in Professor Garis's new book. The author commences his treatment far back in the colonial period and shows how, almost from the beginning of white settlement, a marked differentiation developed between settlers who came from the home country of the colony, that is, colonists in the strict sense of the word, and those who came from other countries and who may accurately be considered immigrants. The attitude of the established colonists was habitually much more genial toward newcomers of the former class than of the latter. The colonies thought of themselves as transplanted sections of one or another European people, as indeed they were. Accordingly they had a spontaneously warm feeling toward those whom they regarded as "their own kind of folks". "Foreigners" were a different matter.

Nevertheless, the need for population was too keenly felt to allow these suspicions and antagonisms to result in the erection of effective barriers against newcomers, especially as the colonists were not their own masters and could do little more than protest. So it came about that while most of the stock arguments for the restriction of immigration were developed during the colonial period no serious check was actually placed on the free movement of settlers from Europe. It was not until conditions arose, long after the country became independent, which made the immigrant a true menace that the demand for effective control of the movement began to voice itself in a potent way.

There followed the first stage of the long struggle for federal immigration regulation, characterized by the consistent refusal of Congress to act and the consequent efforts of the separate states to devise measures that would secure them the necessary protection and at the same time stand the tests of constitutionality. The legal aspects of this conflict are particularly well handled in Professor Garis's book.

As the event proved, it took half a century to produce results. The agitation for control was well under way in the early 'thirties, but it was not until 1882 that the first general immigration law was passed by the federal government. This was essentially a selective law, that is, based upon simple tests of individual fitness. But by the time this was on the books, there was already developing a vigorous sentiment in favor of numerical restriction, and so the second stage of the struggle was under way. The concrete result of this was the literacy test, which, while selective in form, was, and was intended to be, restrictive in its effect. Finally, by the quota laws which followed the war, the principle of restriction was clinched, and the principle of group-selection effectively recognized.



It is a dramatic story, well told, and worthy of careful attention by every one whose interest in the political and social affairs of this country penetrates even infinitesimally beneath the surface.

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD.

#### MINOR NOTICES

*The Sanctity of Law: wherein Does it Consist?* By John W. Burgess, Ph.D., J.U.D., LL.D. (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1927, pp. x, 335, \$3.00.) Has Professor Burgess turned moralist? Has he written a tract bidding America beware of her destination if she does not pause on the highway down which, thanks to her scorn of law, she is hastening? Such questions might well assail those who pick up a book with this title by such a legalist and constitutional student. As a matter of fact, it is simply the story of the struggle of Western Europe and America for freedom, the apogee of all law, and in discussing wherein the sanctity of law consists he draws equally on his vast knowledge of history, philosophy, and social ethics. The weakness of the book is that it is neither history nor ethics, which, unfortunately perhaps, mix with such little advantage to either.

The method is purely historical. The great periods of history are discussed in relation to their efforts to solve the question of the sanctity of law, from the Roman Empire to the League of Nations. But although the author gives his own definition of law he does not give the definitions that have motivated these various civilizations. A book would be valuable which would set forth the theories that have been advanced as to what gives law its sanction or sanctity, then a history of these theories, concluding perhaps with a comparison, a critique, and the author's own theory. But this book is merely a history, stimulating and suggestive enough, wherein the changes in government are attributed almost exclusively to the growing dissatisfaction of the common people with the sanction behind the law.

Many of the author's previously expressed provocative ideas reappear here whether germane or not to the topic. The latter part of the book, by far the most stimulating, brings together a collection of denunciations of law-breakers some of whom form startling bedfellows. His anti-imperialist and isolationist attitude is in strange contrast to his adoration of ante-bellum Germany, apparently as great now as it ever was ("that great national union of middle Europe which, either as a whole or in its parts, has borne the burden and done the work and reaped the glory of the civilization and culture of Europe and of the world, in large—if not largest—part"). One would think that the League of Nations, for having, even if tardily, admitted this national paragon, would be entitled to some credit as maintaining the sanctity of law; but on the whole, it is consistently damned, one reason being that it is dominated by the Great Powers. Yet the chapter on the League sets forth some wholesome truths

that must be admitted by its friends; and the criticism is that of one who wishes its improvement rather than its abolition.

Apart from an important error of date which sets the Algeciras Conference in 1908, no factual errors are apparent, but both the good taste and the style might be impugned. Personal references abound and much is made of the author's professorship in Berlin; the phraseology makes the book difficult reading. There are many sentences so involved as to occupy more than half a page of text.

JULIAN PARK.

*Cambridge Ancient History*. Volume of Plates, I. Prepared by C. T. Seltman, M.A. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan, 1927, pp. xxviii, 395, i.e., 197 plates. 25 s.) It has been long and repeatedly announced that in lieu of illustrations in the monumental volumes of the *Cambridge Ancient History* a volume of plates would issue to cover the first four volumes. We must leave to the editors a decision as to the wisdom of this course but it must be frankly stated that the result is a sore disappointment. It may well be that illustrations could not be given in the volumes as they were planned and executed, but as it falls out in the end the reader does not find an illustration with the text as he reads, but must turn to another volume in which he may or may not find any picture of an object of which he has been reading. And now that the volume of illustrations is before us disappointment has deepened into despair. There are far fewer illustrations than were justly hoped for, and the choice is often bad, and the reproduction of the plates far behind the resources now available for such work. When we compare the printing of these plates with those published in volume I. of *A History of the Ancient World*, by M. Rostovtzeff (Oxford, Clarendon Press), the contrast is amazing. It is however not only that the illustrations are often (I do not say always) poorly printed, but they are not drawn from the best sources; so, for example, the picture of the Temples at Dêr el-Bahri (p. 88) made from a photograph by Dr. Hall is far inferior to the one in Rostovtzeff (p. 94) made by the Metropolitan Museum, New York. There is no picture of the great pyramids, though a beautiful one is in Breasted, *A History of Egypt* (p. 117), and of all three at page 118.

But if the illustrations of Egypt are both too few and ill chosen, still worse are the Babylonian and Assyrian. One might suppose that Kish were the only site excavated, so large a rôle do its pictures fill. The only explanation is that Langdon chose them. There is a picture of the top of Hammurabi's Code, but none of the main body of the text, just as there is given the panel with Jehu before the Assyrian king, but none of the entire black obelisk of Shalmaneser III. from which it was taken, and the legend accompanying the original is omitted. On the other hand the Balawat Gates have two whole pages allotted to them, but Sargon II. is not represented at all, though much is made in the history of the art of his day, and pictures of the king were available in Olmstead's *History of Assyria*.

It is however foolish as well as distasteful to labor the point. The fact is that this volume which costs seven dollars is a failure. It has no index, and one finds what one may by searching through the table of contents, where the entries are usually not sufficiently descriptive or detailed to locate any particular illustration. It is most earnestly to be hoped that a second volume of plates, if and when it appears, may be much better done.

ROBERT W. ROGERS.

*India's Past: a Survey of her Literatures, Religions, Languages, and Antiquities.* By A. A. Macdonell, Emeritus Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1927, pp. xii, 293, 10 s.) Great hopes are naturally raised by the title of this book and its author's position. We are led to expect a summary but authoritative account of all that present-day scholarship can tell of "India's Past". On laying it down, however, one is forced to ask himself, to what class of readers will it be useful? It is too jejune to interest or benefit greatly anyone not already in love with the subject. Very large parts of it read like a mere catalogue of authors and books. Little attempt is made to clothe these skeletons with substantial flesh. Still more rarely do the desiccated figures show signs of coming to life. Even when the author pauses for description, it is trivial externalities which chiefly engage him. No one would carry away from the book many impressions of interesting personalities, or of great ideas, or of broad cultural movements. A single instance will suffice. Not quite a page is devoted to Śāṅkara, probably the greatest of Indian philosophers. His chief works are named, and such momentous facts are recorded as that "his sentences are long and involved". But as to what his ideas were, or their significance for the history of Indian and universal philosophy, all we learn is that he taught "strict monism" (with no hint of what that meant to Śāṅkara), and distinguished two kinds of "knowledge", a lower for the masses, and a higher for the philosophic few. Yet even some Western thinkers have regarded Śāṅkara as one of the greatest philosophers of all time; and in India, at least, he is still, after more than a millennium, unrivalled in his influence on the thought of all those who think at all. No one would guess these facts, still less the reasons for them, from reading Macdonell.

As for scholars, it is perhaps hardly fair to expect that so brief a manual could contain much information for them. But there are surprising defects in it, even considered as a mere catalogue. Some important recent work is entirely ignored. There are many signs of hasty and perfunctory composition; and anything which might be controversial is generally skimmed over or avoided as far as possible.

Many excellent cuts are provided, chiefly illustrating Indian architecture. Aside from these, the contents would have been more fitly described by the title "History of Indian Literature". The major part of it appears to be, in fact, a more or less revised form of the author's *His-*

*tory of Sanskrit Literature* (1899). There are only a few scattered paragraphs on the fine arts, epigraphy, numismatics, etc. Religion is treated very inadequately and almost exclusively as a feature of literary works; political, economic, and social conditions are hardly mentioned.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

*A Pageant of India.* By Adolf Waley. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927, pp. x, 556, \$6.00.) The publishers announce on the jacket of this book that it is "the first history of India which is both authoritative and of interest to the general reader". Whatever authority it may have is derived from the secondary or tertiary sources on which it appears to be exclusively based, and the identity of which can only be guessed from the very scanty foot-notes; for there is no other bibliography, aside from the mention of three books in the preface. It is essentially an account of Indian political history from the beginnings of the Mohammedan conquest to the death of Aurangzeb, that is, from 712 to 1707 A. D. To this is prefixed a section of seventy-five pages on the period from "the dawn of history" to 712 A. D., which might better have been omitted or, at least, reduced to a few pages. It contains many misstatements, such as, that the Aryas of Vedic times "believed in one God, Brahma, the Creator", and were "governed by elected chiefs" (p. 4), or that "it was the code of Manu which gave formal and permanent shape to the caste system by dividing it into four great castes" (p. 5). The Buddha's personal name is always (seven times in two pages) misspelled Siddhartha. It is evident that the author knows little of indigenous Hindu culture. At times, where historical knowledge does not exist, he seems to have filled the gap with romance; at least one would be interested to know the source of the following (p. 20): "Bindusara, during his peaceful and uneventful reign extending over twenty-five years, proved himself a worthy successor to his father, continuing his beneficent policy both at home and abroad and leaving a prosperous and contented empire to his son Asoka." In point of fact we know practically nothing of Bindusara; even his name is far from certain. And this instance is not isolated.

Such imaginative treatment is less necessary in Mohammedan times. In the nineteenth century such investigators as Tod, Elliot, and Briggs made accessible, one would suppose, as many of the endless petty wars and barbarities, perpetrated by the (chiefly Moslem) potentates of that period, as the most ardent lover of blood and horror could desire. The story is unappetizing, and seems to this reviewer essentially dull, except for the single interesting personality of Akbar. Its main outlines have been adequately told by Vincent Smith. Mr. Waley contributes more details, and a livelier style. Without having checked his account thoroughly, I incline to think that it is reasonably faithful to its sources, on the whole, despite the suspicious circumstances noted above. Possibly it will be "of interest to the general reader". I should hope that that perhaps mythical

personage would be more interested in another kind of "pageant of India", the intellectual and cultural life of the Indian people. But this, I fear, does not interest Mr. Waley.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

*Saint Amand, Apôtre de la Belgique et du Nord de la France.* Par Édouard de Moreau, S.J., Ph.D., Litt.D., Professeur d'Histoire de l'Église au Collège Théologique et Philosophique de Louvain. (Louvain, Édition du Museum Lessianum, 1927, pp. xii, 367, 25 fr.) Probably the most valuable part of this excellent volume is the critical introduction in which the meagre sources for the life of St. Amand are all carefully sifted and evaluated, and of this introduction certainly the most valuable portion is that which deals with the anonymous *Vita Prima*, which is the ultimate source of almost everything known about the saint, and which since its publication in a critical edition by Krusch in 1910 has been assigned to the Carolingian epoch and has enjoyed a very poor reputation. Father de Moreau has succeeded in partially rehabilitating this source. By the most careful and patient criticism he has been able to show that the author was probably a priest of the diocese of Noyon, who wrote between *ca.* 710 and *ca.* 750, perhaps about a half-century after St. Amand's death; that he was personally unacquainted with the saint and made use of no written source, but depended wholly on oral tradition. "Mais appartenant au diocèse . . . dans lequel le saint avait passé la plus grande partie de sa vie, il est aisément parvenu à reconstituer son *curriculum vitae* et à réunir des épisodes prouvant sa sainteté." Thus the *Vita Prima*, though not a good source, is far from valueless, and, used with proper caution, it can tell us something about the life and personality of the saint.

In an appendix (pp. 317-319) Father de Moreau has set down conveniently on three pages all the dates which can be established in connection with St. Amand's life and a summary of the known or probable facts concerning him. In view of the extreme paucity of our information it seems doubtful whether a biography extending to 240 pages was warranted. The volume contains much valuable matter concerning the world in which St. Amand lived, but this is sometimes distracting, and too much space is given up to hypotheses and conjecture. The author hardly sustains the fine critical attitude which he reveals in his introduction, and the miracles and legends have not always received the drastic treatment which they deserve. But if one finishes the book with a certain sense of disappointment, with a feeling that a great historic personality has somehow eluded him, this is no fault of the author; with such sources as now exist a really satisfactory life of St. Amand can not be written.

C. W. D.

*La Domination Arabe en Arménie: Extrait de l'Histoire Universelle de Vardan.* Traduit de l'Arménien et annoté par J. Muyldermans. (Louvain, J. B. Istas; Paris, Geuthner, 1927, pp. 176, 50 fr.) This book

contains a portion of the Armenian text of one of the medieval historians of Armenia, Vardan the Great (thirteenth century), accompanied by an annotated French translation. No complete translation, save for Emin's Russian version, has ever been made of this author. The previous editions of the text by Emin (Moscow, 1861) and L. Alishan (Venice, 1862) have been compared, and in addition the variants of two Venice manuscripts (A = 516 and B = 1244) have been noted. Five other manuscripts in the library at San Lazzaro have been neglected as being late in date and inferior in text. It seems strange that the editor neglected the Vatican manuscript mentioned on page 10. Manuscript B has the better text of the two, and is also superior to Emin's codices, as Muyldermans clearly shows. He betters the text not a little and restores a number of expressions omitted by Alishan because of the Turkish censor. One can criticize the arrangement of the apparatus criticus as lacking in clarity. The translation in passages checked seems accurate; page 89, note 7, I should read *ergumardoç*, singers, in place of *erdumardoç*, foyers, and take *k'aghak'anut'ean* in the technical sense of the monastic manner of life, like the Greek *politeia* in hagiographical texts. A more serious lack in the book is the unsystematic manner in which the sources of Vardan are analyzed. There are numerous notes on sources, but what we need and miss here is a detailed comparison of his work with the extant Armenian historians with a view to determining the lost works he employs. This makes the book a torso, deprives it of the distinct value it might otherwise have had, and leaves it merely useful. I miss Gelzer's *Sextus Julius Africanus* in the bibliography.

R. P. BLAKE.

*Kaiser Heinrich IV., und seine Helfer im Investiturstreit.* Stil-kritische und Sachkritische Untersuchungen von Bernhard Schmeidler. (Leipzig, Dyksche Buchhandlung, 1927, pp. xvi, 422, M. 25.) Professor Bernhard Schmeidler of Erlangen University, who is already known to students of the history of feudal Germany by masterly editions of Adam of Bremen's *Gesta* of the bishops of Hamburg and of Helmold's *Chronica Slavorum*, in addition to a volume of critical studies entitled *Hamburg-Bremen und Nordost-Europa vom 9.-11. Jahrhundert*, has followed up these researches by a critical inquiry into the regesta and diplomata of the Emperor Henry IV., with a view to ascertain from internal evidence who were the obscure but influential persons in the imperial court who framed and directed his policy. In pursuit of this investigation he has not rested content with the published texts but has had recourse to the original manuscripts. Indeed, palaeography and style or form of expression have been two of his strongest kinds of evidence. In this kind of research, which is of a new sort and deserves to be done with many other medieval monarchs, a pioneer work is Andreas Walther's "Ueber Personengeschichte und Politische Geschichte" in his *Anfänge Karls V.* (1911). But in the case of Henry IV. the importance of ascertaining



who these unknown counsellors were was pointed out by Roehrig as far back as 1866 in a Halle dissertation entitled *De Secularibus Consiliariis Heinrici IV.* Even without these intensive researches enough is known from the testimony of contemporary annalists, especially Lambert of Hersfeld, to substantiate the value of the subject. For Lambert continually inveighs against the "familiares", "auricularii", "consiliarii", "consultatores" around Henry IV.

All future estimates of the life and reign of Henry IV. will have to take this work into account. For side by side with the great and familiar figures of Adalbert of Bremen and Benno II. of Osnabrück now emerge into the light from the obscurity of anonymity other persons of the time who dictated policy less openly but with little less influence than they. There were five of these "dictators", as Professor Schmeidler calls them, four German, one an Italian. Only one of these has been certainly identified by name, Gottschalk of Aachen. The mysterious Adalbero A is conjectured to have been Abbot Gumpold of Michelsberg in Bamberg. But the identity of the Mainzer, Speyerer, and Italian dictators eludes discovery. Nevertheless, the character and policy of all five is made clear.

Although highly technical, this work ought to be of interest and value to a student interested in the principles and practices of historical method. For clarity and cogency of demonstration I have not seen its like in a long time. For the benefit of his reader the author has summed up this method in chapter X. in a terse but illuminating way. Indirectly, in the course of these researches Professor Schmeidler has contributed new criticism to some of the most important narrative sources of the period, notably the *Vita Heinrici*. Another by-product is new addition to the forged documents emanating from the workshops of the bishops of Bremen and Osnabrück. Chapter VIII., upon the organization and inner working of the imperial chancery, is a valuable contribution to the subject of *Urkundenlehre*. Nothing so notable as this work has appeared upon the reign of the great Salian emperor since Holder-Egger's edition of Lambert of Hersfeld's *Annales*, which devastated that chronicler's reputation forever.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

*The History of Yaballaha III., Nestorian Patriarch, and of his Vicar, Bar Sauma, Mongol Ambassador to the Frankish Courts at the end of the Thirteenth Century.* Translated from the Syriac and annotated by James A. Montgomery, Professor in the University of Pennsylvania and the Philadelphia Divinity School. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1927, pp. iv, 82, \$2.00.) While Marco Polo was making his extraordinary journeys in the Far East two Nestorian monks from northern China, Sauma and Markos by name, travelled westward across the heart of Asia as pilgrims bound for Jerusalem. Not long after their arrival in the domains of the Ilkhan, or Mongol lord of southwestern

Asia, Markos found himself raised to the dignity of metropolitan and subsequently (1281) of patriarch. He was given the ecclesiastical name Yaballaha III. "The reason for his election was this", his biographer tells us: "The rulers of the whole empire were Mongols and there was none who was acquainted with all their customs and policies and language but he." The Ilkhan, Arghon, like other potentates of his dynasty, was extremely well disposed toward the Christians. Desiring the assistance of the pope and of the Christian kings in a projected move to drive the Saracens from Syria and Palestine, he despatched no less than four embassies to Europe. On the recommendation of Yaballaha, Bar Sauma was appointed leader of one of these. Setting out in 1287, with his little party he visited Constantinople, Rome, Paris, and Gascony.

The portions of the Syriac biography of Yaballaha of which Professor Montgomery has given us the first English translation include narratives of the long journey from Peking to Baghdad and of Bar Sauma's experiences on his European expedition. The primary importance of the translation with its excellent introduction and commentary arises from the light that is shed on an "obscure but most crucial chapter in the history of the relations between the East and the West". The famous overland missions of John de Plano Carpini, William Rubruquis, Ascelinus, and others to the Mongol courts have been made known to English readers through the work of Sir Henry Yule, W. W. Rockhill, and C. R. Beazley, but the reverse aspect of these prolonged negotiations—the Mongol rulers' quest for Christian aid—is less familiar.

Besides having this broader interest, the document gives us an insight into the character of two striking personalities, the saintly and able, albeit somewhat poorly educated, Yaballaha and the sharp-witted Bar Sauma, a man entirely capable of holding his own in a discussion of matters of dogma with members of the college of cardinals. Bar Sauma's diary was used by the biographer as the basis for the narrative of the European journey. This medieval Chinaman's observations on the monuments of Rome, on the 30,000 students in Paris, and on his visit to King Ilanar (Angleterre) in Kesonja (Gascony) are decidedly out of the ordinary in the annals of travel, constituting an Oriental's counterpart, as it were, of Marco Polo's richer and more elaborate description of things seen and heard about in the East.

The volume is the first of the *Records of Civilization* to appear under the editorial direction of Professor A. P. Evans. It augurs well for the future of that series which Professor Shotwell initiated and the first seven numbers of which he edited. Professor Evans was fortunate indeed in the selection both of the subject dealt with and of the scholar to carry out the work.

J. K. WRIGHT.

*Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History.* Edited by the late Sir Paul Vinogradoff. Volume IX., *The Social Structure of Medieval East*

*Anglia.* By David C. Douglas, Lecturer in Medieval History in the University of Glasgow. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1927, pp. xii, 288, 18 s.) The author has performed a difficult task with ability and discrimination. He makes a real contribution to the institutional history of East Anglia, drawing the earlier social system of this region from Domesday Book and tracing its development from the available chartularies and manorial extents of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. There are comparisons between East Anglian conditions and those of the Danelaw in general, as already known. Since the post-Domesday materials used nearly all pertain to great ecclesiastical estates, it is difficult to say how far they represent what is typical of these counties. But the conclusions reached are important and striking.

So large a part of the Domesday population of East Anglia was free, that the lordless village was the rule and not the exception. The well-known looseness of association, and the fact that the vill was a stronger unit of organization than the manor not coincident with it, illustrate the backwardness of manorialism. Mr. Douglas shows to a fair degree of probability that a non-manorial village court still existed. As late as the thirteenth century several lords of a single village agree to hold its court in common. The survival of the free Domesday peasantry is traced into the twelfth century when a disintegration of their original holdings was under way. Though a widespread depression of the peasantry is obvious as time passes, manorialism here preserves a contractual element characterized by money rents.

The earlier unit of landholding in East Anglia was the Danish bovate or *manloth*, which, Mr. Douglas holds, consisted of twelve and a half acres. He shows that even in 1086 it did not lie dispersed among the fields of the village but concentrated in a *tenementum* in one particular section. The vill and not the manor is shown to be the basis of geld assessment for freemen. The conclusion that the hundred was here assessed at a hundred and twenty carucates, unlike that of the Northern Danelaw, reckoned at twelve, is strongly upheld. The Norfolk leets, which represent the latter figure, thus become analogous to the hundreds in the land of wapentakes and preserve a similar suggestion of earlier judicial functions. The court of the leet like that of the territorial soke was in existence in the eleventh century. The author accepts Corbett's suggestion that the leet was the original hundred of East Anglia and concludes that the Domesday hundreds had but recently been formed. These findings, like those of Stenton, thus indicate about the time of Canute a shifting of judicial and assessment areas in Danish regions similar to that which Liebermann traces for Saxon England under Athelstan and Edmund.

W. A. MORRIS.

*The Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland.* By Theodora Pagan. (Glasgow, University Press, 1926, pp. xiii, 268, 30 s.) This

book, finished in South Africa in 1926, is apparently the result of researches in Scotland and England brought to an end a few years earlier. This deprived the author of the information contained in some recent works on Scottish municipal history and institutions and on national institutions as well. Among the latter the most noteworthy is Professor Rait's *Parliaments of Scotland*. Had that been available it seems doubtful whether Mrs. Pagan would have made a statement quite so sweeping as that the Convention was "constitutionally unimportant" or "politically . . . of little account", though it may be admitted that it "was never a leader in political or religious controversy". It is from this point of view only that the book's title seems to raise hopes that are not quite realized. The constitutional importance, or, it would be better to say, the importance of the constitutional history of the Royal Burghs and of their Convention is underrated, the discussion of it is hardly adequate to a book with so general a title, and no attempt is made to deal with the difficulties raised by earlier investigators of these points, such, for example, as Cosmo Innes.

Mrs. Pagan is primarily an economic historian, and it is as such that she approaches this subject. Her treatment of this aspect—the most important by far—of the history of the Convention easily makes up for her omissions on the constitutional or political side. We find the same careful research and cautious conclusion that mark the author's earlier work under her maiden name of Theodora Keith. This book is in fact the first satisfactory comprehensive account of the commercial activities of this unique Scottish institution, and it is the more interesting from the fact that whatever be the truth on the disputed question of the antiquity of the Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland, "there seem", as Mrs. Pagan says, "to have been few, if any, institutions in Western Europe which resemble it". It is in several important respects different from the leagues of cities that existed in Italy or Germany from the period of the Middle Ages, from analogous institutions in France or the Low Countries, and from the English Cinque Ports which in some ways seem to furnish the closest parallel to it. In all these the points of resemblance to the Convention are matched by other points of difference no less striking, and in none of them can be found the regularity and permanence that made the Convention so important practically in Scotland right down to the Union. The constitution, the privileges, and above all the activity of this remarkable body in protecting the rights and regulating the activities of the industries, the internal trade, and the external commerce of Scotland mainly from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century are here described and traced historically with the aid of the printed records and of the manuscripts preserved at Edinburgh and in the British Museum.

It is a very careful and a very welcome study of an important subject.

C. H. McILWAIN.

*The English Craft Guilds, Studies in their Progress and Decline.* By Stella Kramer, Ph.D. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1927, pp. xi, 228, \$4.50.) Each study deals with a significant aspect of the history of English guilds between the last of the fourteenth century and the end of the eighteenth. The theme of the first and longest is the formation and the causes of local amalgamations among both the trades and the handicrafts. The second and the shortest is entitled the Conflict between the English Trades and Handicrafts, but it provides also numerous accounts of conflicts between different handicrafts, between different trades, and within the same handicraft or trade. The third "has to do with the final acts in the history of the guilds" and more particularly with the causes of their decline and end.

In the first two studies Dr. Kramer treats several phases of the subject which have previously occupied the attention of Professor Unwin in his *Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. The contrast between their two expositions is striking. The latter formulated sweeping, suggestive generalizations from the study of a comparatively small number of English guilds and the use of Continental analogies. The former makes more extensive researches in the English materials and reaches narrower but more substantial conclusions. Where the findings of the two conflict the more recent writer seems generally to have the better of the argument (*e.g.*, pp. 39, 76-78, 124), though in one instance, at least, she appears to misapprehend his position (p. 64). Though Dr. Kramer's treatment is sometimes corrective of Professor Unwin's, it is more commonly supplementary. Where, for example, he emphasized as causes of amalgamation such broad economic phases as the conflict between commercial and industrial capital, she dwells upon the importance of such causes as the desire of guilds to end competition with each other, or the need of union felt by guilds so reduced in prosperity that they could no longer meet singly the burden of municipal charges.

Dr. Kramer's principal contribution is the presentation of much new detailed evidence. She has ransacked printed local records and utilized several manuscripts in central repositories, although she has not consulted local muniments excepting those of Coventry. From the documents thus discovered she sets forth those experiences of large numbers of individual guilds which relate to the subject under discussion. She establishes, for example, by the enumeration of individual instances, that, by the middle of the sixteenth century or the beginning of the seventeenth, "an amalgamated company of mercers and ordinary merchants, more or less comprehensive in character", was more nearly universal in English boroughs (pp. 5, 38-40) than either Gross (*Gild Merchant*, pp. 127-139) or Unwin (p. 78) seems to have recognized. The method of accumulating large numbers of illustrative cases results in a narrative which is sometimes complicated and hard to follow, but it fills some notable gaps in our knowledge of the later history of the guilds.

W. E. LUNT.

*Correspondentie van Willem III. en van Hans Willem Bentinck, eersten Graaf van Portland.* Uitgegeven door Dr. N. Japikse. Gedeelte I., Het Archief van Welbeck Abbey. Deel I. [Rijks Geschiedkundige Publicatiën, 23.] (The Hague, Nijhoff, 1927, pp. xlviii, 565.) Stimulated apparently by the publication in 1924 of Mrs. Grew's *William Bentinck and William III.*, Dr. Japikse has undertaken for the Dutch Commission for Historical Publications to edit the correspondence of the two, beginning with the copious collection in the possession of the Duke of Portland at Welbeck Abbey. From this collection two volumes are apparently to be derived. The present one contains 400 letters, of which the first two-thirds are the mutual correspondence between the stadholder-king and his intimate friend and trusted minister and advisor, letters written in fairly good French; the remainder are letters which came to the one or the other from the Netherlands, more than half of them letters of the pensionary Heinsius to William III., written in Dutch. A few letters have come from King William's Chest at the Public Record Office. The editing is excellent. The letters cast much new light on William's reign—and a few of them on the earlier part of his life—and exhibit clearly the important position and influence of Bentinck. The second volume will contain letters that came to the two friends from correspondents in England, Germany, Spain, the Spanish Netherlands, and France.

*Recueil des Textes Législatifs et Administratifs concernant les Biens Nationaux.* Tome I., Septembre 23, 1789-Décembre 30, 1791. [Commission de Recherche et de Publication des Documents relatifs à la Vie Économique de la Révolution.] (Paris, Leroux, 1926, pp. xviii, 425.) This collection of legislative texts and of administrative acts and circulars has been brought together to facilitate the study of documents touching the sales of public lands, the subject of one of the first series of documentary publications undertaken by the French Commission on the Economic History of the Revolution.<sup>1</sup> Hitherto students have relied for an account of the vicissitudes of legislation or policy upon the guidance which Professor Marcel Marion gives in his volume on the *Vente des Biens Nationaux pendant la Révolution* (Paris, 1908), or have collated the laws for themselves from the records of the assemblies. One important element in the present collection could not be obtained from the *procès-verbaux* or from reported debates. This is the circulars and instructions sent out by the Registry Office (Régie de l'Enregistrement), which had charge of the confiscated property, or by the Administrator of the Extraordinary Fund (Caisse de l'Extraordinaire), who should receive the proceeds. Collections of instructions and circulars of information were published during the Revolution for the officers concerned, but they probably can be found in few libraries outside France. Several of the circulars are now published for the first time. It is obvious that a

<sup>1</sup> See page 317 of the *Review*.



circular of instructions is often more informing than a text of legislation. To be convinced of this fact, one need only read Amelot's circular of December 15, 1791, which fills forty-four pages of the present volume. Here the particular difficulties and misunderstandings incident to so gigantic an operation in property values are carefully explained. The volume stops at the close of the year 1791, but, as the editors remark, by that time the system of sales was established in its general lines, which persisted throughout the Revolution. The preface, written by Pierre Caron, contains a brief account both of the Registry Office and of the Extraordinary Fund, together with a sketch of Amelot, the first administrator.

H. E. BOURNE.

*Le Monde Anglo-Saxon au XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle.* Par P. Vaucher, Professeur à l'Université de Londres. [Histoire du Monde, publiée sous la direction de M. E. Cavaignac, tome XII.] (Paris, Boccard, 1926, pp. 243, 20 fr.) It is unlikely that M. Vaucher's little summary will be of interest to readers of this review. Considering the author, the scope and the size of the volume, and considering again the announced ambition of the editor of the series to present the facts of world history in proportions more correct than those customarily observed, one approaches the book with the expectation of finding a well-balanced and probably suggestive *aperçu*. But it is to be feared that most readers will soon lay it down with the feeling that they have been reading a curiously disjointed, ill-proportioned, and faulty text-book. More than half the space is naturally given to Great Britain and the British Empire, fifty pages to the United States, and the rest, in the form of a rather irrelevant introduction and some quite irrelevant appendixes, to the political history of nineteenth-century Europe in general, the development of European capitalism, the evolution of the larger states of Latin America, the unification of Italy, and the Seven Weeks' War. Within these limits the matters treated are selected so much at random that, to quote one conspicuous example, Peel's ministry might be supposed to have passed the first factory legislation. Worse still, the errors seem innumerable. Some, such as the dating of Castlereagh's death at 1820, and the printing of "Lowet" for Lovett may be charitably ascribed to incredibly careless proof-reading; but surely no Parisian type-setter could repeatedly invest Melbourne with a dukedom, or discover that the relaxation of the navigation system during the 'twenties consisted in permitting the inhabitants of Great Britain's Eastern possessions to trade with foreign countries at their will. One could hardly even endow him with the command of idiom displayed in the rendering of the sacred initials G. O. P. as the "Great Old Party".

H. C. B.

*Studies in Economic History: the Collected Papers of George Unwin.* Edited with an introductory memoir by R. H. Tawney, Reader in Economic History in the University of London. [Published for the Royal Economic Society.] (London, Macmillan, 1927, pp. lxxiv, 490, 15 s.)

*George Unwin: a Memorial Lecture.* By G. W. Daniels, Professor of Commerce and Administration in the University of Manchester. (Manchester, The University Press, 1926, pp. 46.) This collection of essays, lectures, and reviews by the late Professor George Unwin, some previously published, others not before published, with a sympathetic biography, is a gracious and suitable memorial to him. At the same time it awakens anew the sense of the unseasonableness of his death. So vivid a personality, so thorough a historical scholar, and so eager a teacher and interpreter of history, might have been spared, it would seem, to bring his life-work nearer completion. For all his substantial works of research were in a certain sense a preparation for making inferences and generalizations to which he had been led in his study and thinking. No one who talked much with him could fail to be impressed with the seriousness with which he wished to draw lessons from history. This characteristic is brought out strongly also in the *Memorial Lecture* by his student and later colleague, Professor G. W. Daniels, and in the biography in this volume by Professor R. H. Tawney.

For a student and interpreter of economic history Unwin was extraordinarily well equipped. His origin and early training in actual working-class life; his entrance into Oxford from the outside, so to speak, and yet his ready absorption of the best it had to give; his training in economics and wide reading in philosophy; his contact with political life as secretary to Lord Courtney, and above all his idealistic nature, made his inferences of the uselessness of war, of the injuriousness of a nationalist policy, of the dangers of imperialism and such other teaching as solid as they were unfamiliar.

There is something of all this in the scattered papers in this volume, but not much. They are concerned with such questions as the origin and some of the early problems of city life, with the history of manufactures and trade in certain periods of English history, with full notes of a "History of Commerce" he had planned, including a series of lectures on the Merchant Adventurers given by him at Oxford in 1913. The Merchant Adventurers have been attacked by trenches and parallels, as it were. The three studies by Lingelbach have discussed them, chronologically, in their origin, at the time of their full organization, and at the close of their career; Ehrenberg and Hagedorn have given their connection geographically with Hamburg and Emden; Gross, Schanz, and others have treated them, incidentally, along with other subjects. Unwin has here about a hundred pages of a new study of that organization, in which he studies their significance from an interpretative point of view, contending, in opposition to earlier historians, that English commercial progress was achieved in spite of their political privileges, not as a result of them. But he left this subject, like so many others, uncompleted, and the Merchant Adventurers still await their systematic historian. Like many other scholars who are also teachers Unwin has done some of the best of his work in the form of influence on his students who have later become

scholars and they, especially, will value and utilize these survivals of his scholarship, his personality, and his opinions, even while they grieve at his loss.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

*The Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain.* By Georgiana Putnam McEntee, Ph.D. (New York, Macmillan, 1927, pp. x, 312, \$2.50.) Miss McEntee at the end of her book gives the net result of her study in a brief statement which is a good illustration of clear, well-defined method, incisive discrimination, and terse expression. These excellent qualities win confidence in her pioneer investigation of the activity of British Catholics in social reform, a confidence which is sustained by her evident scholarship in gathering data, an intelligent relation of them to the economic and political movements of the time, an agreeable candor, and scrupulous care to avoid exaggerated claims.

Naturally the period with which she deals is recent and brief. Beginning with a well-considered account of Cardinal Manning's bold championship of social reforms when there were as yet few followers, she exhibits the relation of subsequent Catholic leaders to phases of Socialism and to the British Labor party. Here, and throughout, Miss McEntee emphasizes the fact that with agreement on principles Catholics have been free to diverge on methods of their practical application. The high point of the movement comes with the emergence of the Catholic Social Guild in 1909 as an organization of serious non-partizan education of the laity in the varied problems of social conditions and the recent expansion of this in the Catholic Workers' College and the Catholic Women's League. The concluding chapter shows the interaction of this British movement with kindred activities on the Continent, attempting a due estimate of the foreign influence of Cardinal Manning and Father Charles Plater, and ends with an indication of the energetic entrance of this movement into the efforts for World Peace. The materials of this orderly study and its bibliographical references are of value for social historians present or to come.

The inexorable economic law once held up as a barrier to social reforms has certainly proved elastic enough in recent years to allow some approximations to Christian ethics. To be sure, cynics explain the social legislation of Germany and England as a manoeuvre to lure organized workmen from the grasp of dangerous teachers, but this simple explanation will not stand. Either with sympathy or aversion legislators have heeded the public opinion of well-to-do classes increasingly responsive to ethical standards. The genesis and growth of this type of public opinion and the measurement of its practical effect in the conduct of society makes an attractive problem for the historian and one feature of his task is to determine how far any of the objective achievements may be credited to the Christian Church or a saving remnant within it, for no matter how slowly the teaching of equal moral dignity and mutual good-will is ac-

cepted, it is taught in all branches of the Church and is the essential relation of Christianity to modern democracy. Dr. T. Parker Moon's work on the Social Catholic Movement in France is an important aid in such an inquiry and it is now supplemented by Miss McEntee's judicious and interesting work.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

*The Russian Imperial Conspiracy, 1892-1914.* By Robert L. Owen. (New York, Albert and Charles Boni, 1927, pp. x, 212, \$2.00.) Senator Owen's discussion of the policy of the Russian and French governments in the years immediately preceding the war is based upon the De Siebert documents and Marchand's *Livre Noir*, as well as upon the current writings of the so-called revisionists. There is nothing new in the point of view or in the argument advanced and this part of the book calls for little comment, excepting that it is an extreme statement, based at times upon fallacious reasoning and on the whole very poorly constructed. No attempt is made to present an orderly array of facts. It is simply a confused mass of data, some of it irrelevant and some of it repeated in varying connections *ad nauseam*.

The writer expresses it as his opinion that the two collections mentioned above "are sufficient completely to disclose the truth with regard to the launching of the World War and the manner in which it was done", but it is hard to see how this unhistorical and easy-going attitude could have led him to his main thesis. The theme of the book is that the Franco-Russian military convention of 1894 was an aggressive instrument from the beginning and that from the date of its signature the Russian and French leaders were under contract to attack Germany. This is the really novel part of the book, and to say that this whole basic argument has been demolished by other writers is to condemn the whole unfortunate performance in the fewest possible words. If Senator Owen had read two critical studies by Germans (the excellent essay by Eugen Fischer in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* for April, 1923, and Otto Becker's *Das Russisch-Französische Bündniss*, 1925), or even the present reviewer's articles in the *Slavonic Review* for March and June, 1925, he would hardly have been able to write this book. It is not too much to say that anyone who has examined the evidence on the origins of the Franco-Russian Alliance would admit that at the time the Russians would have preferred an agreement with Germany, that they resisted the idea of an alliance with France as long as they dared, that the convention as finally signed was strictly defensive, and that for years it was hardly more than a dead letter. When put into its proper setting even the much-quoted remark of Boisdeffre to the effect that "mobilization is a declaration of war" loses almost all significance. Only the writer's insufficient acquaintance with the literature and his constant arbitrary interpretation of documents enables him to maintain his position. His quotation of the protocol of the staff conferences on page 42 is a flagrant case in point

and a number of others might be cited. The space allotted to the reviewer makes it quite impossible to enter upon a discussion of detailed points, but the book appears to him to be wrong from the bottom up and hardly worthy of being classed as serious history. There is no question of Senator Owen's sincerity, courage, and eagerness for the truth, but even a revisionist must wish that this book had not been written.

WILLIAM L. LANGER.

*Ten Years of War and Peace.* By Archibald Cary Coolidge. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1927, pp. iv, 276, \$3.00.) Many good precedents exist for bringing together in book form historical papers and addresses previously published in periodicals or in the proceedings of learned societies. E. G. Bourne's *Essays in Historical Criticism*; *History and Other Essays* by Frederick Harrison; Lord Acton's *Lectures on Modern History*, and recently Professor Cheyney's *Law in History and Other Essays* are well-known examples.

Of the ten essays comprising this volume, three deal with American and six with European problems and their relation to world politics. Among the former, *Two Years of American Foreign Policy* tells of the early successes of Secretary Hughes; *After the Election*, of the advent of President Coolidge, while the *Future of the Monroe Doctrine* sets up the thesis that the Doctrine is still one of the nation's most "cherished dogmas", as live for the American people to-day "as when it was first enunciated". Despite this, however, the author points out that it has become an anachronism in the face of the rise of Pan-Americanism, the League of Nations, and the growing strength of the Latin American states, by whom it is deeply resented as a piece of presumption and unwarranted tutelage by "los Yankis".

Among the European group, Russia after Genoa and the Hague, Nationality and the New Europe, and the Break Up of the Hapsburg Empire are of especial interest. The last named is the only paper not previously published. The subject is one on which Professor Coolidge is particularly qualified to speak. For centuries the empire of the Hapsburgs "played its part, not without glory". It is gone forever, doomed before it fell by the forces of disintegration within, a government carried on by makeshifts in which "every trick had in turn been tried" by 1914. "After an experience of nearly half a century with the Ausgleich, the outlook had never been more unpromising than it was when the murder at Serajevo took place." The temptation to "find a way out by risking everything on one great throw of the dice" (p. 257) was strong. In this connection the statement that universal suffrage was introduced in Austria in 1906 (p. 255) needs correction. Why Austria and Hungary "were cut down to the bone" in the peace treaties is carefully analyzed as is also the "extraordinary demand that Germany must acknowledge her guilt as the author of the war" (p. 111).

The essay on the European Reconquest of North Africa published in this *Review* in January, 1912, is a little out of line with the title in that it belongs entirely to the pre-war years. Moreover, it is a pity that in this case, at least, the story was not carried through to its completion. Even as it stands it is one of the best in the volume.

The style and organization of all the papers is clear and logical. The author has an interesting habit of stating conclusions and making comments in a semi-sententious manner that arrests attention and challenges criticism. "It [the United States] has been prompt to claim 'equal opportunities' but slow to admit equal responsibilities." "To-day we have peace once more, but of good will . . . among nations, there has been a deplorable decrease" (p. 106). "Even Poland and Rumania owe their size to the triumph of Lenin as well as to that of Wilson" (p. 114). "There is a young Tunisian party as there is a young Egyptian" (p. 219). Many of the opinions and comments will arouse antagonism, but if the controversial character of the questions discussed is considered they will be relatively few. In general the essays are fair and judicious, the fruit of ripe scholarship in the field of contemporary politics, broadened by direct professional and personal contact with men and events.

WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.

*The Fascist Dictatorship in Italy.* By Gaetano Salvemini. Volume I. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1927, pp. x, 319, \$3.00.) Professor Salvemini's name, known to the historical world for his brilliant essay on Mazzini and, more recently, for his studies of the Adriatic question, commands attention for this volume. As an opponent of Fascism Professor Salvemini was driven from his chair in the University of Florence and from Italy. He is one of the persons for whom the Fascists—to use their own formula—have deliberately "made life difficult".

The present volume is not an account of the Fascist régime, but rather of the Fascist party. The author sees the latter as the product of a peculiarly aggravated "post-War neurasthenia", which assumed its present form and objectives only after all real danger of a "Bolshevist" revolution was past. He traces its evolution from its origin, in 1919-1920, in the action of groups of patriotic and impecunious youths, through the reaction of 1921, when, after the economic and social crisis was over, the movement came under the domination of a group of frightened industrialists, to the climax in 1922, when it received its hierarchical organization and an anti-parliamentary direction from a military "Black Hand", who executed the coup d'état of October, 1922. Professor Salvemini devotes the bulk of his volume to an accumulation of evidence that since that date Mussolini, despite his claim to have achieved stabilization, has given Italy a régime of disorder, directed by men of violent and brutal passions. His arraignment culminates in a chapter on the Matteotti murder in which he weaves a net of circumstantial evidence to substantiate his conviction that Mussolini was an accomplice in that crime.



The book is not a discussion but a brilliant invective; it is not the work of the historian but of the persecuted idealist. Its tone recalls the orations against Catiline. The evidence at Professor Salvemini's command is necessarily scanty and onesided. He brings to it his training in critical discrimination, and he is cautious in his explicit inferences, but he uses freely the most dubious evidence to lend color to his picture of brutality and illegal force.

One is bound to question the value of such an attack on the Fascist régime for the illegal use of violence, when Mussolini repeatedly and openly assumes responsibility for acts of violence and declares that "when two incompatible elements are at war, the only solution is force". On the other hand Professor Salvemini's volume supplies an antidote for Fascist propaganda. The author devotes particularly savage attention to the inaccuracies of Signor Luigi Villari. Furthermore, in facsimiles of telegrams and manuscripts and in extracts from letters and inquests, he presents the English-speaking public with a mass of evidence that challenges discussion. His volume helps to dispel the inevitable atmosphere of "legend"; it makes clearer the historical complexity of the Fascist movement. It is to be hoped that in the next volume Professor Salvemini will attempt to weigh the constructive activities of the Fascisti against the crimes for which this one is such a scathing arraignment.

KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD.

*On the Trail of the Russian Famine.* By Frank Alfred Golder and Lincoln Hutchinson. (Stanford, University Press, 1927, pp. xii, 319, \$3.50.) This work, the joint product of two trained observers and competent historians, is a valuable contribution to the rapidly increasing literature on Soviet Russia. Professors Golder and Hutchinson have limited themselves to a severely objective and impartial account of one definite phase of Russia's stormy history, the great famine of 1922. Content to agree with the Bolsheviks on famine relief and disagree in politics, the authors spent nearly two years in special investigation, of a purely technical character, for the American Relief Administration and have recorded in diary form their findings and observations from August, 1921, to March, 1923.

The wide extent of the famine area carried them across the entire face of European Russia from Petrograd and Odessa to Armenia and As-trakhan in crisscross journeyings that are well visualized by the special map inserted on the inside front cover. There are numerous illustrations. In addition to the specific data on food conditions, which was the first objective of their research, the authors, as students of the social sciences, have recorded much that is of human interest, both tragedy and comedy. The approach and treatment is not that of the artist painting a canvas with broad, colorful sweeps, but the detailed, analytic, even microscopic research of two Hoover agents on the trail of famine. But their commentary on the social, the economic, political, and religious aspects of the

revolution, though incidental, is extremely valuable and informative, consisting mainly of verbatim transcripts of conversations held with peasants, Soviet officials, university professors, intelligentsia, workers, and members of the old régime.

Platform speakers and propagandists, both paid and unpaid, who assure American audiences that the masses in Russia, from the beginning, enthusiastically supported the Bolshevik régime, should ponder long and thoughtfully over pages 41, 42, 43, 47, 50, 51, 53, 60, 62, 64, 65, 68, 69, 100, 121, 207, and 236.

The authors probably do not regard their survey as a complete description of the famine intended for wide popular reading. Hence they have made few of those concessions to human frailty, beloved by the average reader—variety of letterpress, frequent indentations, or outstanding divisions of the material. The book rather presents page after page of solid reading matter broken only by the necessary headings of chapters, in chronological sequence and interspersed with date lines indicating the days when the respective notes were made. But for historians, economists, and serious students of the social and political sciences in general, their contribution will serve as a source of first-hand, authentic information on the famine and the effects of revolution in Russia, presented in a style that is readable and vivid, yet restrained and scholarly, relieved by humor and touched, at times, with pathos.

EDMUND A. WALSH, S.J.

*A New-Englander in Japan: Daniel Crosby Greene.* By Evarts Boutell Greene. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927, pp. xii, 374, \$5.00.) In writing the life of his father, Professor Evarts Boutell Greene has not only presented a fascinating picture of the intellectual and spiritual growth of a man, but has made a distinct contribution to our knowledge of Japan's development since the Restoration. Not that he has discussed with any great completeness the political, economic, or legal aspects of that development; on the contrary he has contented himself with drawing a picture, too seldom seen, of the side of the subject which the missionary saw, namely, the clash of Christianity and the indigenous religions, and the results of that clash upon the missionary enterprises and the Japanese. His principal detailed studies concern such enterprises as the translation of the Bible into the vernacular, the attempts at church union on the part of the various Christian sects in the field, the right of the missionary schools, especially the Doshisha, to carry on religious instruction, the degree of financial support and consequent control of the Japanese Christian churches by the missionaries, and the controversy over theological doctrines between the conservative Evangelicals and the Liberals.

This record of the struggles of the missionaries to maintain their position of leadership in the face of the rising nationalism of the Japanese during the last decade of the nineteenth century and thereafter throws a

great flood of light upon the situation in which analogous groups in China find themselves to-day. Perhaps it would not be too much to say that the student of contemporary Chinese history will find this part of the biography of the greatest interest and use to him.

The record of the life and work of this distinguished missionary to Japan as it is here presented, is totally lacking in those qualities which give such books as *MacKay of Formosa* and *Livingstone's Last Journals* their universal appeal. Instead of the near-miracle worker, there is the quiet student, or at most the missionary diplomat and man of affairs, attempting a solution of his various problems by the application of patience, understanding, and tolerance. The milieu in which Greene found himself in Japan was entirely different from that of Livingstone in Africa. The Japanese were not primitive savages but a highly civilized people, and when Greene knew them first, were busy working out a great destiny mainly in accordance with the norms of progress known to Western peoples. The Christian missionaries played no startling part in modern Japanese history, but they contributed one of the influences, if a minor one, in the remodelling of Japanese life. Nevertheless, what they accomplished, as recorded in this book, is of the greatest interest, and Professor Greene is to be congratulated upon his illuminating and valuable contribution by bringing us intimately in touch with one of the greatest and most admirable of our missionaries to the country.

W. W. McLAREN.

*Memorials of Naibu Kanda.* Edited by the Kanda Memorial Committee. (Tokio, Toko-Schoin, pp. vi, ix, 516.) Baron Kanda (1857-1923), son of a scholarly minister of the Emperor of Japan, came to this country in 1871, and spent here eight years of education, four in the Amherst High School, four in Amherst College, from which he was graduated in the class of 1879. The rest of his life was spent in Japan, except for occasional governmental missions to this and other countries, of which the last was his attendance at the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armament, as special adviser to Prince Tokugawa. In the main his life was spent in educational work, to which he applied an extraordinary knowledge of the English language and literature, a reflective and judicious mind, much organizing ability, and a statesmanlike conception of the needs of his young countrymen. In the University of Tokio, the Higher Commercial College, the School of Foreign Languages, the School of Peers he taught English as his major subject, served on many educational commissions, wrote extensively, and did his utmost to promote knowledge and understanding of America among the Japanese, and friendly relations between the two countries. The memorial volume which his associates and relatives have prepared contains an excellent account of his life by Professor T. Ueda, of the University of Tokio, contributions and tributes by a number of friends, various early essays and translations and letters, illustrative of his education and development, several

later lectures and addresses, and a body of selections from Baron Kanda's journal of an educational trip around the world in 1900-1901. Baron Kanda was a gentleman of the highest quality, and the volume is a record of a noble and useful life.

*The Colonisation of New Zealand.* By J. S. Marais, M.A., D.Phil., Lecturer in History in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. (London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1927, pp. xii, 384, 15 s.) Dr. Marais here presents a full and well-balanced account of the work of the New Zealand Company and of the organizations that founded the settlements at Otago and Canterbury. The study traces the origin and history of the company in considerable detail, discusses its plan of colonization and the varying fortunes of its settlements from 1840 till about 1852, explains its relations with the governments at home and in New Zealand during this period, examines the causes of the failure of the company, and analyzes its services to New Zealand. The treatment of the Otago and Canterbury associations is less complete, but their work was really subsidiary to that of the company. Of the irregular colonization which had taken place earlier than 1840 and of that which went on independently of the above mentioned organizations we learn little, except about the government settlement at Auckland.

This book was originally presented as a thesis for the degree of doctor of philosophy at Oxford, but it represents more thorough research and riper scholarship than that we are accustomed to find in doctoral dissertations. Dr. Marais has ransacked the English archives and has also explored the Archives Nationales in Paris for material on his subject. Of printed sources the only important omission noted by the reviewer is *Letters of J. R. Godley to C. B. Adderley*. The author has read with care the secondary works that have appeared in England dealing with the early history of New Zealand, except Dr. Harrop's *England and New Zealand*, which came from the press after Dr. Marais had finished his study.

Dr. Marais evidently started out as an admirer of E. G. Wakefield, but as the research proceeded the glaring defects of the Wakefieldian scheme of systematic colonization became obvious and this study confirms, if indeed this be necessary, the impression that Wakefield, although unrivalled as an agitator, lacked the knowledge, foresight, and patience required of a successful colonizer. The heedlessness with which the New Zealand Company began to sell land and to send out colonists without having explored even the coast of New Zealand, let alone having surveyed the land, stands as a heavy charge against Wakefield and his associates. With these facts before us we wonder why Dr. Marais describes Sir James Stephen as an opponent of colonization when he merely opposed hasty and immature schemes and did not actually block the effort to have New Zealand annexed and colonized by the government. Dr. Marais takes the side of the company against the missionaries; maybe

his Boer ancestry has left him a little biased on that score. In his treatment of the Canterbury settlement the author clearly underestimates the financial difficulties with which Godley had to contend in carrying the settlement through its infancy, and the reviewer inclines to the opinion that the departure from Wakefield's principles, rather than the adherence to them, as stressed by Dr. Marais, was chiefly responsible for the success of Canterbury.

But these are minor points, and Dr. Marais deserves praise for the way he has handled an important episode in the expansion of the British Empire and the founding of a new dominion. The book has a fine index and a valuable bibliography, but, strange to say, while it fairly bristles with unfamiliar place-names, it has no map.

PAUL KNAFLUND.

*Cortés the Conqueror: the Exploits of the Earliest and Greatest of the Gentlemen Adventurers in the New World.* By Henry Dwight Sedgwick. (Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1926, pp. 390, \$5.00.) The ever-fascinating narrative of the exploits of Hernando Cortés is interestingly re-told in this book. The author early confesses and throughout his narrative exhibits the greatest admiration for the "gallant, reckless, deep-revolving adventurer". Nevertheless he is not blind to Cortés's faults and his "brilliant unscrupulousness", and where the latter's record is questionable or his conduct not above reproach he does not fail to attempt to portray the true facts. Occasionally, however, as on pages 136-137, the author resorts to an argued or labored defense of Cortés.

The author states in his preface that his narrative "keeps close to the chroniclers". In his appendix (p. 381), however, he states that he has "in the main" followed Bernal Díaz del Castillo (*The True History of the Conquest of New Spain*, Maudslay translation), whom he regards "as the best authority on our subject". This is evident from a perusal of the narrative, for, while this is not scientifically annotated, in it there are numerous parenthetical citations to or else quotations from the well-known history by Bernal Díaz. Next to the latter history the equally well-known letters of Cortés are cited or quoted from most frequently. Gómara, Las Casas, and the other chroniclers and contemporary authorities receive scant reference.

The author apparently has been smugly content to endeavor to keep "close to the chroniclers". At least there is no evidence that he has made any use of the many original and not overworked records of the Cortés period that have been compiled by Navarrete, Pascual de Gayangos, and Father Mariano Cuevas. The book does contain, however, one real contribution. This consists of a facsimile reproduction of an original and theretofore unpublished manuscript letter by Cortés now in the Library of Congress. An English translation of this letter constitutes Appendix I. Unfortunately, in the printing of the facsimile reproduction of this letter, pages three and five of it became transposed, with the result

that the order of the pages of the letter, as printed, is as follows: 1, 2, 5, 4, 3, 6.

By the very generous use of the first person singular throughout his narrative the author has laid himself decidedly open to criticism. Also he may be criticized for his sometimes apparent inability to restrain his imagination, as, for example, on page 98 where it is stated that "trees and flowers huddled up to one another . . . flowers, flaunting their great petals in rivalry to the butterflies, bushes, and grasses; in the rivers cranes stood on one leg", etc.

The book fills no essential need for the investigator or the critical student of Cortés and his period. As a semi-popular, semi-scholarly account of the life of Cortés it may safely meet the needs of a large group of uncritical readers.

CHARLES W. HACKETT.

*Comparative Colonial Policy, with special reference to the American Colonial Policy.* By V. Shiva Ram, Ph.D., F.R.H.S. (Calcutta, London, and New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1926, pp. xx, 297, \$4.00.) This book has the immediate and laudable purpose of explaining to those who guide or watch the process of world questions the urgent necessity of bringing to pass a better relationship between the European and non-European races. The author holds, and one readily agrees, that the present balance forms one of the most menacing problems of the day which awaits a successful solution to insure lasting peace to a troubled world.

One-half the book embraces an historical examination of the colonial policies of five European powers, Spain, Portugal, Holland, France, and especially England, from the sixteenth century to the present. The author has delved deeply and broadly into the literature of the subject and handles well a mass of information, showing insight and understanding. The chapter on the motives of colonization is especially well done. There are, however, certain limitations of method and balance. When a broad array of facts, pursued through a long period, is reduced to brief form, it is impossible to analyze complex situations fully, to use qualifications freely, or to give the lights and shadows which make up so large a part of historical processes.

A considerable portion of the book is devoted to a thorough examination of the American experiment in the Philippines. The author sees in the American policy a light to lighten the way of Europe in readjusting its balances with the people of Asia. The author also gives an excellent chapter to the League of Nations and the Mandate System. These two experiments are viewed as an expression of a new attitude which holds out the hope of a better future in the relations of diverse peoples.

As a native of India, Professor Ram sees much to criticize in the old capitalistic exploitation of non-Europeans by Europe. There is no doubt that it is open to just criticism, not only from the standpoint of the wel-



fare of the non-European, but also from the bad effect of present imperialism upon European democracy. What he has to say should find a hearing and stimulate a recognition of the important fact that the present imperial balance needs immediate readjustment. It seems fair to say, however, that he looks at the problem so steadily from the vantage-ground of one standing in Asia, that he fails to appreciate the difficulties and complexities confronting the powers of Europe.

W. T. Root.

*A History of American Foreign Relations.* By Louis Martin Sears, Ph.D., Professor of History in Purdue University. (New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1927, pp. xiv, 648, \$3.50.) Following the recent publication of the excellent treatise of Dr. John H. Latané on the history of American foreign policy appears this later volume by Dr. Sears, with similar scope but somewhat different plan of arrangement of materials. It is a comprehensive, unified, illuminating survey of chief foreign problems, episodes, issues, and diplomatic adjustments. It is written as a guide to a point of view through leading facts rather than as an exhaustive presentation of every incident or phase of negotiation. It has a unified and easy style which will interest the general reader or the average citizen who likes history.

The treatment is mainly chronological. The first three chapters treat successively the Colonial Period, the Revolution, and the Critical Period ("Divided We Fall"). Thereafter treatment is by presidential administrations, rather than by larger periods. Administrations receiving the largest space are Jefferson's (41 pp.), Roosevelt's (38 pp.), and Wilson's (52 pp.). Proper proportions are usually maintained. A few exceptions are noticeable. Slidell's mission of 1845 receives five pages while Trist's mission receives only three. The Venezuelan boundary dispute (6 pp.) occupies three times the space devoted to the Geneva arbitration (2 pp.).

Dr. Sears suggests that all will find in the thread of foreign policy and diplomacy an extraordinary and surprising continuity surviving alternations of political party. Referring to the inspiring characters who gave the impetus to diplomacy and directed it he says: "Our secretaries of state have averaged higher in ability than our presidents, particularly in the period since the state portfolio ceased to be the avenue to the presidency."

The American attitude in the World War is treated as the high-light of the narrative. One can easily detect the author's admiration for a few important figures such as Jefferson and Wilson. Interesting is his designation of the most brilliant episodes and high-water marks of diplomacy for each President or administration of the last four decades. In locating the highest point in Rooseveltian diplomacy he apparently had some difficulty.

The treatment of controversial questions is usually judicial and discrete. An exception appears in an injudicious reference to the "rape"

of Panama (p. 565). The author explains, however, that the policy of recognition of Panama, even though the "indecent haste" was little calculated to inspire Latin American confidence, "was justified if ever the end justified the means". The assertion that the defeat of the Versailles treaty in the American Senate was chiefly due to Roosevelt (who had died ten months earlier) is not proven. Surprising is the unsustained assertion that Anglophiles, who have had a tendency to make odious comparisons in their countrymen's disfavor, have had too much influence in American foreign policy (p. 302).

Dr. Sears seems to be too optimistic concerning America's future relation to the League.

The volume is practically free from errors. The few which appear are minor ones.

Foot-note references are frequent. The bibliography, chosen with discrimination and arranged according to chapters of the book, is not exhaustive but is especially valuable for magazine articles which the author says represent much of the best literature of diplomatic history. It is followed by a chronological table (11 pp.) and a list of the Secretaries of State. The index (22 pp.) seems adequate. Unfortunately the map equipment is limited to a single one-page map of the United States, which is inadequate.

J. M. CALLAHAN.

*The Diary of Orville Hickman Browning.* Vol. I., 1850-1864. Edited with introduction and notes by Theodore Calvin Pease and James G. Randall, University of Illinois. [Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library, vol. XX.] (Springfield, Illinois State Historical Library, 1925 [1927], pp. xxxii, 700.) Senator Browning kept diaries throughout the years 1850, 1852-1879, 1880-1881, which are extant and are possessed by the Illinois State Historical Library. Browning, as a Whig politician and lawyer in Illinois, a senator from that state in 1861-1863, Secretary of the Interior from 1866 to 1869, and intimate friend of Lincoln, stood close to many great and interesting events in history. His diary at many points casts light on these happenings, but not so much as might reasonably be expected from the position of the writer and from the size of the present volume (the first of two). Browning was not a man of insight or imagination. His observations are not especially acute; his reflections, which are not often set down at all copiously, were of second-rate quality. Plainly he saw no greatness in the great man with whom he was most intimately associated. As a senator, he evidently spent a large part of his time in those small errands for constituents and others which take so much of the ordinary congressman's time. Moreover, his daily record could without loss of profit have been abridged in print, large parts of it being trivial; *e.g.*, almost every day, of the four thousand recorded in the present volume, begins with a record of the weather. Nevertheless, the mass of records of important political hap-

penings and conversations is impressive, and will be turned to good account by many a worker. The annotations are all that could be desired.

*Reminiscences of Adventure and Service: a Record of Sixty-five Years.* By Major-General A. W. Greely, U. S. A., Retired. (New York, Scribner, 1927, pp. xi, 356, \$3.50.) General Greely, now eighty-three years of age, reviews in an exceedingly interesting volume the incidents of a long life of public service, first as a private soldier in the Civil War, rising to the rank of captain, then as an officer in the regular army, serving in the western plains, as the commander of the celebrated Arctic expedition of 1881-1884, as the chief signal officer of the army, in and before the Santiago Campaign, as developer of the United States weather service, and finally as major-general. There is much entertainment in the reminiscences he gives, in the concluding chapters, of Presidents and their wives, premiers and other foreign potentates, explorers and travellers. The student of history will chiefly value the light cast on ordinary conditions of service in the Army of the Potomac and on the operations of the Santiago expedition, whose commander, it may be remembered, refused at the outset to take with him from Tampa a field telegraph train which the chief signal officer had provided.

General Greely's narrative is not written with much exhibition of modesty, but criticism is disarmed by his constant and genial praise of other men, of all sorts, whom he has encountered in his pathway through a world which he has found in the main delightful, and by the obvious zest and vigor with which he has pursued as well as described his career.

*Minutes of the Court of Albany, Rensselaerswyck, and Schenectady, 1668-1673.* Translated and edited by A. J. F. Van Laer, Archivist, Division of Archives and History, State of New York. Volume I., *Continuation of the Minutes of the Court of Fort Orange and Beverwyck.* (Albany, University of the State of New York, 1926, pp. 356, \$1.00.) The historical importance of Albany amply justifies the publication of still another series of its early records. While the present volume will be of interest primarily to the genealogist and the antiquarian, it is not without interest for the historian. The board of magistrates, whose records are here presented, functioned chiefly as a court, both civil and criminal. In its proceedings one may study the manners, morals, and business methods of a Dutch Calvinist fur-trading community. The board also passed local ordinances regulating such matters as Sabbath observance, the baking of bread, and, above all, the Indian trade, which was the principal business of the town.

As regards this trade it was the policy of the magistrates to confine it to the palisaded area of the town, and to enforce conditions making for equality of competition among the traders. Thus trade at Schenectady, which was under the jurisdiction of the board, was forbidden, apparently with but indifferent success. Taking goods to the Indian country was

discouraged; running to meet the Indians and enticing them within private dwellings to trade were prohibited.

Hitherto the Albany traders had concerned themselves little with the political implications of their position in relation to the French and Indians, but the time was approaching when they could no longer ignore them. The operations of French Jesuits among the Iroquois attract attention; there are rumors, in 1671, of a French attack. In that same year French *coueurs de bois* come to trade, among them a certain Robertus Renatus de la Salle, surely none other than the famous explorer. La Salle, then, was not exploring the Mississippi in 1671. In such incidents one glimpses the development of those wider relationships which were soon to make Albany the centre of French and Indian politics for all the northern English colonies.

A. H. BUFFINTON.

*Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia.* Edited by H. R. McIlwaine. Volume II., August 3, 1699–April 27, 1705. (Richmond, Virginia State Library, 1927, pp. xi, 492, \$5.00.) Students of Virginia history will welcome the appearance of the second volume of the *Executive Journals of the Council*. The period covered, from 1699 to 1705, is one of great importance, a period of economic and social changes, of strife in political and church affairs. It was at this time that slaves were beginning to pour into the colony to take the place in the tobacco fields of the indentured servants and the freedmen, that thousands of poor whites were moving to the frontiers or northward to Pennsylvania and Delaware to escape the competition of slave labor. The colony was just entering upon a new era of expanding production which was to quadruple its population and wealth in less than half a century. It was a period, also, of bitter contention, when Governor Francis Nicholson was trying to break the power of the Council of State, that narrow aristocratic group whose position in Virginia was not unlike that of the House of Lords in England; when Commissary James Blair was laboring to reform the local church in the face of opposition from vestries, governor, and even a part of the clergy.

Upon all these matters the volume throws much light. We see the irate Nicholson calling the council members around him to upbraid them for their action in denouncing him to the Board of Trade; we see the great tobacco fleet under convoy of an English war vessel, waiting at the entrance of Chesapeake Bay to begin its voyage across the ocean; we see the indefatigable Blair laboring for his new college, quarrelling with the clergy, preferring charges against Nicholson. In fact, one finds in these journals information concerning all kinds of colonial activities—the suppression of pirates, the defense of the frontier against the Indians, the collection of duties, the granting of land patents, the fur trade, gifts to schools, the disposal of French refugees, the construction of the capitol at Williamsburg, illegal trading, intercolonial relations, proclamations against profanity and drunkenness.

The *Executive Journals of the Council* thus constitute an invaluable addition to the printed material on Virginia history, and rank in importance with Hening's *Statutes at Large*, the *Journals of the House of Burgesses*, the *Legislative Journals of the Council*, the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, and the *William and Mary Quarterly*. The correspondence of the Board of Trade, so far as it relates to Virginia, is largely unpublished. But Dr. McIlwaine intimates that when the *Executive Journals of the Council* have been completed, the board of the Virginia State Library will begin the publication of these papers. This is good news indeed.

Dr. McIlwaine has done the editing with the same care which characterizes all his work. There is a short preface, and an excellent index of no less than thirty-six pages.

THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER.

*History of Illinois and her People.* By George W. Smith, assisted by an advisory board. Six volumes. (Chicago and New York, American Historical Society, 1927, pp. lxii, 452, 496, 444, 432, 432, 432, \$42.50.) This is a history produced and published on the advance subscription plan, three of the six volumes being devoted to biographical sketches of past and present residents of Illinois. Among members of the historical profession generally there seems to exist a prejudice against this type of publication which the reviewer does not share. If a book is to be produced someone must pay the cost of producing it. Unless author and publisher bear it, it must be borne by the purchasers of the volume. The advance subscription plan provides an efficient and appropriate method of placing the cost of production upon the consumer, where it properly belongs.

It follows that subscription histories, like all others, are to be judged on their individual merits. Some are very good and some are deplorably bad, and the quality in any given case will depend upon the two-fold factor of the capacity of the author and the conditions which govern his work. Unfortunately, as we view it, subscription publishers are usually much more willing to appropriate liberally for print and illustrations than they are for the cost of authorship. The author, therefore, either does his task as a labor of love without regard to monetary return, or he does it too hurriedly in order to obtain a measurably adequate compensation for the time and labor expended. The result in such cases is obvious.

The author of the work before us is head of the department of history in an Illinois State Teachers' College, and the author of a *Students' History of Illinois*. His three narrative volumes contain over 1300 pages, and half a million words. Notwithstanding these facts, the subscribers were entitled, in the reviewer's judgment, to a better history than Professor Smith has given them. Too much of trivial or inconsequential character has been supplied them, and too little care has been devoted to evaluating the matters presented. To illustrate somewhat at random, a

single line of a statistical table (III. 416) covers the subject of meat-packing in Illinois; while to a cyclone of March 18, 1925, eight pages are devoted, and to the centennial celebration of 1918, forty-one are given. Errors of fact, of inference, or of proof-reading are deplorably frequent. In a single paragraph (I. 100) half a dozen have been counted. Many errors are evidently the result of mere carelessness, *e.g.*, 1763 for date of Jolliet's visit to Chicago, 1774 for surrender of Fort Necessity, "Fort Chart" for Fort Chartres. Others are of more serious import, indicative of a lack of mastery of the subject under discussion, *e.g.*, the statement that Harrison's army at Tippecanoe included several hundred Indians (I. 271, 272); or that prior to 1670 the French government had never taken much interest in the work done by the Church in the far West (I. 67).

It seems evident to the reviewer that the work is a piece of somewhat careless and indiscriminate compilation rather than one of scholarship. Supporting evidence for this conclusion might be cited in ample abundance; the illustrations already given will perhaps suffice for those who will read this review.

*California and the Nation, 1850-1869: a Study of the Relations of a Frontier Community with the Federal Government.* By Joseph Ellison. [University of California Publications in History, vol. XVI.] (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1927, pp. xi, 258, \$3.50.) Federal relations of the states constitute a comparatively neglected field in American political history. This monograph supplies needed information and discussion on that general subject for twenty years of the pioneer period in California. It does not so much break new ground as amplify and bring together topics having relation to its inclusive theme. Principal chapters of part I. treat of Mexican land grants, federal land grants to the state, mineral land issues, Indian questions, grants for internal improvements, means of communication and overland transportation. Part II. treats Civil War issues, sentiment for a Pacific Republic, loyalty and disloyalty, and status of legal tender notes in the state. Mr. Ellison has made use not only of Congressional debates and documents but also of California state publications and newspapers. His bibliographies are extensive and mostly admirable. Yet one wonders why text and notes fail to show use of published and unpublished correspondence of participants in subjects he treats. Why also the failure to carry out consistently the excellent plan of brief notes to show contents of Congressional documents? And is the distinction between contemporary works and secondary materials always justified? The index is made on sound principles and is ample.

Mr. Ellison's "Retrospect" recognizes that California's federal relations were essentially the same as those of other frontier communities which have looked to the central government for generous appropriations in money and public lands to establish and maintain all forms of public



institutions besides means of communication and transportation. Yet he maintains that in many respects California's problems were unique. The reviewer is unable to see that this thesis is sustained, for the differences are more in degree than in kind when one surveys each one of the "peculiar" questions in connection with experiences of other frontier communities. Mr. Ellison might well have enriched his monograph by recognition of concrete similarities in the features of federal relations of many Western states, quite beyond the matters of mining and Indian questions.

The extensive use of newspapers evident in this study can not but suggest the perils of uncritical reliance upon such sources even for the actualities of public opinion. Personal bias of editors and proprietors quite often misrepresents currents of public opinion, does it not? One would like to see full recognition of this and consequent critical judgment of newspaper expressions.

C. A. D.

*The Political Career of Stephen Mallory White: a Study of Party Activities under the Convention System.* By Edith Dobie. [Stanford University Publications in History, Economics, and Political Science, vol. II., no. 1.] (Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1927, pp. 266, \$2.00.) The purpose of this monographic study is not so much to interpret the procedure of political leaders as to reveal it. The author has had the advantage of use of a large mass of correspondence preserved by a successful machine politician of an era when control of conventions and party committees determined everything except the voters' choice between candidates named by the bosses. Stephen Mallory White played the game of politics with zest and intelligence, observed the recognized rules of fair play, was frankly personally ambitious, did not lack ideals of public service, but played to win place and power even by methods of traffic in offices repellent to a politician of higher type. He was loyal to his organization, honest in dealings with all, even with factional opponents. His political career covered the years from 1875 to 1900, when the monopoly privileges of the Southern Pacific Railroad and efforts to control them were chief issues in California politics. After 1888 White was a consistent opponent of monopoly but had to reckon with elements in his own party who were subservient to the railroad. Also he had to steer a difficult course between northern and southern factional groups and urban and agrarian interests. Dr. Dobie's study reveals White's skill in management of men, reaching down into the details of county and precinct organization and culminating in control of state-wide party machinery. Clear analysis of abundant evidence makes available material of much value to students of political history who seek knowledge of realities of political life. This extends to the national field, in which Senator White supported the free silver cause and Bryan after having combined with Gorman *et al.* to defeat Cleveland's tariff plans in the Wilson bill. The

California senator's personal qualities and skill in manipulation not only gave him power in the Democratic organization but also made him *persona grata* with the Republicans who likewise played politics as a game.

The monograph is made more usable by appendixes containing an annotated roster of correspondents who wrote frequently to White, diagrammatic statistics of California legislatures, lists of California delegations in Congress, and a bibliography. The index leaves much to be desired, few of its entries affording any clue to the nature of the references as mentioned.

C. A. D.

## COMMUNICATIONS

### TO THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW:

In the *American Historical Review* for July, 1927, in the course of his review of Dr. Gooch's *Recent Revelations of European Diplomacy*, Professor Bernadotte E. Schmitt makes the following statement: "On this last point [the Russian mobilization] Dr. Gooch, in his analyses of Tirpitz's *Politische Dokumente* and Zwehl's *Erich von Falkenhayn*, fails to mention the important revelations that both the admiral and the general, as well as Moltke, opposed making the Russian mobilization a *casus belli*; which plays havoc with the classic German contention."

This statement by Dr. Schmitt raises an extremely important point with regard to the question of responsibility for the World War. If it can be shown that the leading German officers in 1914 did not believe that the Russian general mobilization meant war for Germany, then it is quite obvious that the present effort of German authorities to justify German action in 1914 on this basis possesses no validity whatever. I happened to read this sentence by Dr. Schmitt a couple of days before leaving for Europe, and determined to clear it up as far as possible while abroad. To do so I consulted in person the Kaiser, Herr von Jagow, Count Pourtalès, Admiral von Tirpitz, Count Montgelas, who once had a long personal interview with Bethmann-Hollweg on the subject, and two very prominent members of the General Staff in July, 1914. From these interviews it quickly became apparent that Dr. Schmitt had confused the term "*casus belli*" with the question of whether or not it was, diplomatically speaking, desirable to declare war on Russia or to invade Russia in self-defense without any formal declaration of war. As far as I could discover, there was absolutely no one of importance in Germany in 1914 who did not believe that the Russian general mobilization meant immediate war for Germany. On the other hand, there was a sharp difference of opinion, both in the army and in the civil government, as to whether Germany should counter the Russian general mobilization by a declaration of war on Russia or by military movements against Russia without any formal declaration of war. In the civil government Bethmann-Hollweg and Von Jagow demanded a formal declaration of war. Bethmann insisted upon it for two reasons. Kriege, legal advisor to the Foreign Office, informed Bethmann that it would not be juristically correct to send the ultimatum to Belgium until after war had been declared upon Russia. Further, Bethmann believed that a declaration of war upon Russia would help to rally the Socialists in Germany to a support of the war against Russian autocracy and reaction. In his memoirs Bethmann states that he consented to the declaration because of the demands of Von Moltke,

but we know that this is not true, Bethmann's memory apparently having failed him at this point. Von Moltke was indifferent as to whether war should be declared or not, but wanted to get his troops into action as rapidly as possible. Hence, he held that if Bethmann and Von Jagow were going to insist upon a declaration of war before the Germans could move into Luxemburg and Belgium, then this declaration of war on Russia should be made as speedily as possible. He would have been quite willing, however, to have carried on all the necessary German military action without a formal declaration of war. Von Jagow demanded a declaration of war on Russia because he feared the diplomatic effect of a German invasion of Belgium without the previous declaration of a formal state of war with Russia. He apparently believed that this violation of Belgium without a declaration of war on Russia would affect world opinion more adversely than to have Germany take the first step in the series of declarations of war which were to follow. Count Pourtalès, looking at the whole question from the vantage point of St. Petersburg, differed sharply from Bethmann and Von Jagow. He stated to me that, up to the German declaration of war on Russia, neutral opinion among the ministers and ambassadors in St. Petersburg was overwhelmingly on the side of Germany. He believed that the declaration of war was a great mistake, as it made Germany seem the aggressor, while Russia, the actual aggressor, was put before the world in the guise of a state fighting on the defensive. Count Pourtalès held that the German declaration of war on Russia instead of fighting without any formal declaration was one of the chief diplomatic blunders committed by Germany in 1914. General von Falkenhayn and certain members of the General Staff, while eager for an immediate war upon Russia after the Russian general mobilization, preferred to make war without declaring war, in order to avoid the delays which would be involved in waiting for the civil government to go through the necessary processes of deciding upon war and transmitting the declaration of war to Russia. These officers were less concerned with the diplomatic aspects of the declaration of war than they were with the purely strategic problem of getting the military forces into action with the least possible delay. Admiral von Tirpitz opposed the declaration of war on Russia on exactly the ground taken by Count Pourtalès, namely, that it would impose an unnecessary diplomatic handicap on Germany through making the world believe that she was the aggressor because of having been the first to declare war. The Kaiser took the view that the Russian general mobilization meant war with Russia, whether there was any formal declaration or not, but he yielded to the demands of Bethmann and Jagow, who insisted upon the juristic and diplomatic necessity for the declaration of war.

In short, everyone of importance in the German civil, military, and naval circles in 1914 held that the Russian general mobilization was unquestionably a *casus belli*, but they were not united on the question of whether the answer should be a declaration of war or a state of war not

preceded by a formal declaration. The responsibility for the declaration of war falls solely upon Bethmann-Hollweg and Von Jagow. Pourtalès and Tirpitz opposed the declaration for reasons of diplomatic discretion, while Falkenhayn and some other generals opposed the declaration of war for reasons of military strategy. Moltke seems to have been indifferent to whether war was declared or not, but was desirous of having it declared if his military operations would be delayed by any other procedure.

It may interest the readers of the *American Historical Review* to know that, on the other hand, Counts Berchtold and Hoyos informed me this summer that, to the Austrians, the Russian general mobilization did not imply immediate war but only counter-mobilization and negotiations. As a matter of fact, Berchtold and Schebeko, the Russian ambassador in Vienna, were in communication until August 6.

Very truly yours,

HARRY ELMER BARNES.

THE EDITOR OF THE *American Historical Review*:

Sir: The statement upon which Mr. Barnes comments was based on the following data:

H. von Zwehl, *Erich von Falkenhayn*, p. 58: "In a conversation with the imperial chancellor on the evening [of 31 July] Falkenhayn once more pointed out the danger of delaying mobilization. The notes [in his diary] of 1 August, the day on which the order for mobilization was decided on, are worth giving verbatim and without abbreviation, with the omission only of strictly family matters: 'Persuade Moltke to go with me to Jagow, in order to prevent the foolish premature declaration of war on Russia. The answer is: Too late.' . . ."

A. von Tirpitz, *Politische Dokumente*, vol. II., pp. 11-12: "The imperial chancellor was possessed by the idea, which was incomprehensible to me, that he must, in case the answers from Petersburg and Paris [to the German ultimata] were unsatisfactory, 'clarify the situation' by formal declarations of war. What alleged military necessity there was to require this clumsy mistake in diplomatic technique was a riddle to me from the very beginning. The military authorities did not in any manner urge this step upon the chancellor." In Tirpitz's opinion, "such a declaration was not required by our situation with reference to Russia, for we did not contemplate any invasion of Russia. . . . Nothing compelled us to clarify the situation by a formal declaration of war".

Since the German declaration of war refers specifically to the Russian mobilization, my remark, "both the admiral and the general, as well as Moltke, opposed making the Russian mobilization a *casus belli*", would seem to be warranted. Inasmuch, however, as the three persons mentioned regarded war as unavoidable after the Russian mobilization, it would have been clearer if I had written that they "opposed a declaration of war on account of the Russian mobilization".

The impression left by the two volumes is that the military and naval authorities, with a surer political sense than the civil government, had sought to restrain the Wilhelmstrasse. Mr. Barnes's account of his conversations with high German personages, which reveals, more clearly than do the diplomatic documents or the memoirs of the several actors, the mental processes of the German government at the height of the crisis, shows that this was hardly the case. On the contrary, both Moltke and Falkenhayn wished to begin military operations without a declaration of war. Yet the German Empire was a party to the Hague Convention of 1907 relative to the opening of hostilities, article I. of which reads:

The Contracting Powers recognize that hostilities between themselves must not commence without previous and explicit warning, either in the form of a reasoned declaration of war or an ultimatum with conditional declaration of war.

Now the German ultimatum to Russia (*Kautsky Documents*, no. 490) did not contain a "conditional declaration of war": it merely stated that German "mobilization must follow . . . in case Russia does not suspend every war measure against Austria-Hungary and ourselves within twelve hours and make us a distinct declaration to that effect". Thus the German General Staff was prepared to ignore the Hague Convention as readily as it did the treaty with Belgium. It was presumably to avoid this supreme blunder that Herren von Jagow and Kriege, realizing that operations against Belgium were about to begin, insisted on the declaration of war against Russia. My diagnosis of the situation appears to have been faulty, but I do not see that Mr. Barnes's explanations place the action of the German government in any better light.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *American Historical Review*:

Dear Sir: Professor J. G. Randall in his notice of my book, *James Buchanan and his Cabinet on the Eve of Secession*, states that it was a "doctoral thesis presented to Syracuse University". It was a part of a doctoral thesis presented to Clark University. It was begun, and a portion of it used, as a master's thesis at Syracuse University. Some additions and changes were made before it was put in its present form.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP J. AUCHAMPAUGH.

Oct. 12, 1927.

EDITOR OF THE *American Historical Review*:

Sir: In a very indulgent review of my book *Europe since 1870*, revised edition, that appeared in your July number (XXXII. 920-921), Professor E. E. Sperry makes two statements on which I should sooner have asked permission to comment had I not been absent in Europe. He cites as "minor defects" (1) "an unnecessarily confusing account of the dif-



ference between communism and socialism, a difference now clearly established and well recognized" and (2) that my "description of the German presidency under the new constitution is not accurate".

In my book I cited the apparently indiscriminate use of the terms "socialist" and "communist" in the second quarter of the nineteenth century—when these terms appear to have first come into use; the assertion of a writer in 1833 who spoke of "the Socialist, who preaches of community of goods"; and the fact that Marx and Engels, often thought of as the principal founders of modern socialism, stated their views in 1848 in the *Communist Manifesto*. I said, indeed, that some maintained a distinction, declaring that communism entailed abolition of private property, while socialism would bring only the abolition of private capital, with control by the state of the sources of production and of distribution. I may add that in the opinion of others the socialist, permitting some private ownership, would establish collective ownership of productive agencies, while the communist would have government ownership of all agencies of production and distribution, and of all consumption goods, abolishing private property altogether. But it may be doubted whether most socialists and communists have themselves maintained any clear distinction.

The diversity of aims and lack of clear definition on the part of those who call themselves by either name has long been noticed. In 1912 a writer declared that there had been a reversal of application and meaning in respect of the two terms in later years in that the followers of Marx and Engels, once known as communists, had come to be known as socialists (I. B. Cross, *The Essentials of Socialism*, p. 3). Babeuf desired to establish complete economic equality in France, but he is often named as an early socialist. Complete economic equality might be supposed to result from what some modern commentators call communism, but Émile Faguet in his *Socialisme en 1907* wrote: "J'appelle socialisme toute tendance ayant pour objet l'égalité réelle entre les hommes" (p. 1). Doubtless the most conspicuous example of what is called communism was the work of the Russian Bolsheviks—for they nationalized land and abolished inheritance and private property, yet they themselves called the state which they established the Union of Soviet Socialist (*Sotsialisticheskikh*) Republics.

Some difference might seem to appear in aims and methods: socialists would proceed by evolution and constitutional development, communists by violence and revolution; socialists would be satisfied with less drastic changes than communists sought; but on closer inspection it is generally found that socialists hope for later changes more complete, so that ultimate ends are not very different. In 1911 O. D. Skelton wrote: "The traditional communistic standard is, 'to each according to his needs'. This solution was advocated by the German socialist party in the platform adopted at Gotha in 1875, and while in later programmes the dominance of the Marxian over the Lassallian influence brought dis-

cree silence on the point, it is generally regarded even by the socialists who reject it, as the solution of the far future" (p. 202). In 1925 G. B. Shaw thought that between "communism" and "socialism" there was almost no essential difference.

My assertion that the German constitution of 1919 provides for "a president with real power" (p. 698) was made with full knowledge of the provision, also stated (p. 699), that the executive is largely vested in a ministry dependent on the Reichstag and that each of the president's orders requires countersignature by a minister to make it valid. Yet this president certainly has a position unusual in ministerial government, not only because he is elected by the people but because the constitution gives him power to dissolve the Reichstag—though only once for the same reason (art. 25), and because when a law has been passed by the assembly he may within one month subject such law to referendum before it is put into effect (art. 73). He is not completely above politics, as is the King of England, since he may be deprived of office after referendum held on demand of the Reichstag, and may even be brought before the high court for violation of the laws or the constitution. While the requisite countersignature by a minister may seem to deprive him of power it can protect him from consequences even when he has been able to move a minister by influence or persuasion. German writers have not failed to call attention to the president's prerogatives under the constitution. Dr. F. Giese, *Die Verfassung des Deutschen Reichs* (1920), says that in respect of dissolving the Reichstag the president has greater power than the emperor had (p. 131). Dr. Fritz Stier-Somlo, *Die Verfassung des Deutschen Reichs* (1920), noting that the Germans wanted neither a Swiss *Bundespräsident*—little more than a presiding officer—nor one who like an American president would have almost the power of a dictator, declares that the office of *Reichspräsident* comprises three functions especially: "Die eine besteht in der würdigen Vertretung des Reichs nach aussen und verleiht ihm eine überragende Ehrenstellung. Die andere zeigt sich in Mitwirkungsrechten bei der Ausübung der Staatsgewalt. . . . Endlich fällt ihm eine vermittelnde Rolle zu zwischen Volk und Reichstag, Volk und Regierung" (pp. 138-139). Foreign commentators have spoken with even more certain conclusion. René Brunet, *La Constitution Allemande* (1921), says: "L'idée dominante qui a guidé les Constituants quand ils ont rédigé les dispositions relatives au Président est celle-ci: il faut à la République parlementaire allemande un Président fort" (p. 179); and Edmond Vermeil, *La Constitution de Weimar* (1923): "Les pouvoirs du Président sont réels, mais contrebalancés, eux aussi" (p. 144).

RAYMOND TURNER.

## HISTORICAL NEWS

The managing editor of this journal—managing editor 1895–1901, 1905–1928, director of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington since 1905—has retired from the latter position, having reached an age when such retirement is permitted, and has accepted the new chair of history which has been established at the Library of Congress by reason of the generous gift made toward the endowment of such a chair by Mr. W. E. Benjamin. The Carnegie Institution is appointing no successor to Mr. Jameson, nor is it intended that any successor to Mr. Leland or the late Miss Davenport shall be appointed, but the remaining members of the staff of the Department are to be permitted for the present to continue their work. These decisions of course affect seriously the *American Historical Review*. Since 1903, by an arrangement concerted in that year between a representative of the Board of Editors and a representative of the trustees of the Carnegie Institution, and adopted by the latter body, the Carnegie Institution has aided the *Review* by supplying the managing editor, in the person of the director of its Department of Historical Research. The withdrawal of this support makes fresh arrangements necessary on the part of the American Historical Association. At the meeting of the Executive Council on November 18–19, a committee of five was appointed to consider the future of the *Review* and report plans. The committee consists of Messrs. H. E. Bourne (chairman of the Board of Editors), chairman, W. K. Boyd, E. P. Cheyney, E. B. Greene, and J. F. Jameson. It held a meeting in Washington on December 10, and expected to make at least a provisional report to the Council at the time of the annual meeting of the American Historical Association. The present managing editor, however, will continue to act as such till the completion of the July number, and thus of the present volume of the *Review*, after which he will retire from the editorship in order to take up his new duties at the Library of Congress. His function there will be, in general terms, to mediate between the rich historical treasures of that establishment and the studious public, and in particular to be useful to the members of the historical profession, to whose cordial support in the maintenance of this journal he has been for so many years most deeply and gratefully indebted.

So much demand has been made for additional copies of Professor Jernegan's article on "Productivity of Doctors of Philosophy in History" that the paper has been reprinted as a separate pamphlet, copies of which can be had, in any reasonable number, by application to the editorial office of the *Review*. Price, 25 cents; for ten or more, ten cents.

Copies of Miss Beatrice A. Lees's *Short Bibliography of Medieval History*, furnished by the (English) Historical Association, are still available at the office of this journal for gratuitous distribution to any members of the American Historical Association who may apply.

#### AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

##### THE ENDOWMENT FUND

Just as we go to press, the managing editor receives the following letter from Mrs. Albert J. Beveridge:

Beverly Farms, Massachusetts, Dec. 20, 1927.

Dear Dr. Jameson:

It is my intention to give the American Historical Association fifty thousand dollars in memory of my husband.

I am enclosing my check for twenty-five thousand and expect to give you the remainder within the next two years.

If it is possible I would like it kept in a separate fund bearing my husband's name and devoted to research in American history, and that whatever sum or sums may be raised from other sources and intended as a memorial to him, may be added to it.

You know how deeply interested he was in the object of the endowment fund. The last time he spoke in public was to plead its cause.

I would like you to feel that this comes from him as his tribute to the Association and to historical research.

Sincerely yours, CATHERINE BEVERIDGE.

The announcement which will be made of Mrs. Beveridge's generosity at the time of the annual meeting will certainly evoke the warmest gratitude on the part of the members of the Association. It had been agreed at the meeting of the Executive Council in November that, with the consent of the donors, the contributions to the Endowment Fund received from Indiana (a state exceptionally generous toward that object) should be given a separate status as a fund for historical research in memory of Senator Beveridge, whose devoted labors on behalf of the Endowment are held in grateful remembrance. It is now to be expected that the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund, constituted by Mrs. Beveridge's munificent gift, shall be augmented according to her desire by the addition of the sums thus given or to be given by his friends in Indiana or elsewhere. Thus a great name, of one whose services and personal qualities had endeared him to the Association, will receive fitting and permanent commemoration. [See also page 514.]

Vol. I. of the *Annual Report* for 1922 has been published and distributed to members. In the endeavor to catch up arrears, the Committee on Publications has reduced this volume within the compass of 370 pages. In the main this has been effected by presenting only abstracts, somewhat jejune, of twenty-nine papers read at the New Haven meeting. Secretary Hughes's memorable address on Some Aspects of our Foreign Policy is given in full, as is also a paper by the late Gaillard Hunt on the Genesis of the Office of Secretary of State. Proceedings of the meeting, of its

attendant conferences, and of the Pacific Coast Branch fill the remainder of the volume.

At the meeting of the Executive Council held in New York on November 18 and 19, it was reported that the American committee's part of the *Bibliography of Modern English History*, the Tudor portion, would soon be completed, while the British portion, relating to the Stuart period, was all in galley-proof (Clarendon Press); and that in the campaign for the increase of endowment, committees had been at work in thirty-six states or districts, Professor Harry J. Carman generously continuing to officiate as general secretary.

The Nominating Committee has suggested for election at the annual meeting to be held in Washington, December 28, 29, 30, the following: for president, James H. Breasted of Chicago; for first vice-president, James Harvey Robinson of New York; for second vice-president, Evarts B. Greene of Columbia University; for members of the Executive Council, Laurence M. Larson, Frank M. Anderson, James T. Adams, Dwight W. Morrow, Payson J. Treat, and (new nominations) Fairfax Harrison, Samuel E. Morison, and Winfred T. Root. Mr. Harrison has, however, declined the nomination.

The Pacific Coast Branch, aided by a grant from the treasury of the Association, has begun the practice of printing in an annual pamphlet the *Proceedings* of its annual meeting. That for the meeting held at Stanford University in November, 1926 (the twenty-second annual meeting, pp. 83), contains useful papers read on that occasion: one on the Status of Sources and Literature for Pre-War History, by Professor Oliver H. Richardson; one on British and American Tariff Policies and their Influence on the Oregon Boundary Treaty, by Professor Robert C. Clark; one on the High Coast of Living in Sixteenth-Century France, by Professor Franklin C. Palm; one on the Peace Programmes of the British Labor Party, by Professor Carl F. Brand; and one on the Character of American Participation in European Affairs since the War, by H. H. Fisher.

Members of the American Historical Association are reminded that applications for the grants in aid of research offered by the American Council of Learned Societies in 1928 should be addressed before January 31 to the Chairman of the Committee on Aid to Research, Professor Guy Stanton Ford, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. These grants range from \$50 to \$300, and are awarded to mature scholars to assist them in conducting definite projects of research which they have in hand. They are not applicable to work done in the fulfillment of requirements for any academic degree.

#### PERSONAL

Dr. Frances Gardiner Davenport, since 1905 a valued member of the staff of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institu-

tion of Washington, died at Washington on November 11. Born in 1870, she was educated at Barnard and Radcliffe colleges, in England, and at the University of Chicago, where she received her degree of Ph.D. in 1904, publishing her dissertation as a book on *The Economic Development of a Norfolk Manor* [Fornsett]. During the year 1904-1905 she taught at Vassar College. Her work for the Carnegie Institution consisted in the preparation of a series of volumes of *European Treaties bearing on the History of the United States*. The first volume, containing the early papal bulls and the treaties, to those of Westphalia, 1648, inclusive, with learned introductions, bibliographies, and notes, was published in 1917. A manuscript amounting to two more volumes, extending through 1713, was left substantially complete at the time of her death, needing only some minor revisions before publication. The cheerful courage with which, under the shadow of an illness known to be fatal, she continued her work till the last hour in which it was possible, will never be forgotten by those who were privileged to be her associates.

Miss Davenport was a lady of much learning in history and languages. She entertained the highest ideals of scholarship, and was faithful to them in all her work, unwearied in research, scrupulously fair, broad in survey and in scholarly interests, and sound in judgment. Her intellectual integrity and elevation of character were accompanied by abounding and genial kindness, especially toward younger women, beginners in that world of scholarship to which she was enthusiastically attached.

Dr. James K. Hosmer died on May 11, at the age of ninety-three. His Civil War experiences gave rise to two notable books: *The Color Guard* (1864), and *The Thinking Bayonet* (1865), valuable records of service in the ranks. In later years he produced the two Civil War volumes (1907) in the *American Nation* series. His chief books however were three excellent Massachusetts biographies, of Samuel Adams, of Sir Henry Vane, and of Governor Thomas Hutchinson (1885, 1888, 1896). A genial and sprightly companion, he maintained his intellectual vigor to a great age.

Dr. Charles H. Levermore died on October 21, at the age of seventy-one. He was one of the 41 original founders of the American Historical Association, of whom but eight or nine now remain. He was professor of history in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and in Adelphi College, of which he was president for nineteen years. His historical books were: *The Republic of New Haven* (1886), and *Forerunners and Competitors of the Pilgrim and the Puritan* (1912).

Rumania has lost the chief student of her archaeology and early history by the untimely death of Vasile Pârvan on June 26, at the age of forty-five. Professor in the University of Bucarest, director of the Bucarest museum, director of the Rumanian School in Rome, secretary of the Rumanian Academy, vice-president of the Union Académique Internationale, his unwearying labors in his chosen field had accomplished an



extraordinary amount of valuable work, including an early volume on the younger days of Marcus Aurelius, a large collection of the Christian inscriptions of the Daco-Rumanian region, and those sumptuous volumes of the *Ephemeris Daco-Romana* (in Italian), *Dacia* (in French), and *Getica* (in Rumanian), which have been recently described in these pages.

Gustave Fagniez died on June 18, at the age of eighty-four. He had an important part in the early work of the *École des Hautes Études*, and under its auspices published in 1877 his *Études sur l'Industrie et la Classe Industrielle à Paris aux XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> Siècles*. From the foundation of the *Revue Historique*, in 1875, he was for several years the associate of Gabriel Monod in its editorial conduct. Besides many articles in that and other journals, he published in 1895 a notable work on *Le Père Joseph et Richelieu*. His later writings concern social developments in the early seventeenth century.

We have also to report the death of Professor Charles Seignobos, of the University of Paris, notable for writings of high merit on the methodology and philosophy of history and for his *Histoire Politique de l'Europe Contemporaine* (1897, 1924).

It is announced that Baron Alexander von Meyendorff, of Kings College and the London School of Economics, Professor J. H. Baxter of the University of St. Andrews, and Professor Nicholas Iorga of the University of Bucharest, will be lecturing in the United States during the coming spring.

Professor Dixon R. Fox of Columbia University sailed for England in December, to serve till next summer as director of the British branch of the American University Union.

Ralph E. Turner has been made associate professor of history in the University of Pittsburgh.

Professor Percy S. Flippin, formerly of Mercer University, has become head of the department of history in Coker College, Hartsville, S. C.

Miss Bertha A. Reuter of Wesleyan College, Macon, Ga., has resigned to become head of the department of history of Lindenwood College.

Professor Arthur P. Whitaker, of the Florida State College for Women, is on leave of absence during the present academic year and is engaged as research professor of American history in Vanderbilt University.

The following professors from other institutions will teach in the summer session of 1928 in the University of Chicago: Professor Carl Stephenson of the University of Wisconsin will give courses in medieval history; Professor Albert Hyma of the University of Michigan will treat the Reformation; Professor R. D. W. Connor of the University of

North Carolina, the preliminaries of the Revolution; Professor R. C. McGrane of the University of Cincinnati, the Jacksonian Era; Professor A. O. Craven of the University of Illinois, the United States since the Civil War; Professor H. F. MacNair of St. John's University, Shanghai, foreign rights and interests in China; and Professor R. B. Mowat of Oxford University, European diplomacy, 1916-1925.

In the University of Wisconsin we note the appointments of Chester P. Higby and Laurence Saunders as professor and associate professor of history, respectively. Paul Knaplund has been advanced to a full professorship.

Professor Clarence W. Rife of Hamline University, Saint Paul, has been promoted to become professor of history and head of that department in the university; Arthur S. Williamson has been made assistant professor of history; and Grace L. Nute has been appointed curator of manuscripts at the Minnesota Historical Society and part-time instructor in history in Hamline University.

Dr. W. R. Livingston has been made assistant professor of history in the University of Iowa; Dr. Ruhl J. Bartlett of Iowa has been appointed assistant professor of history in Tufts College; and Chester H. Kirby, also of Iowa, has been made assistant professor of history in Brown University.

In our October issue we stated that Professor M. R. Gutsch had been promoted to an associate professorship in the University of Texas; we are now informed that Professor Gutsch has been given a full professorship in that university.

#### GENERAL

American scholars who expect to attend the sixth International Congress of Historical Sciences to be held at Oslo on August 14-18, 1928, are invited to communicate with the chairman of the American committee, Mr. Waldo G. Leland, at 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

Scholars who wish to present papers at the Congress are requested to submit the titles of the proposed papers, with a brief indication of their contents, to the committee not later than February 1. Circulars containing information about the Congress, its regulations, etc., together with membership blanks, will be supplied upon request. The membership fee is \$5.50, and entitles those paying it to receive in advance the printed abstracts of the papers, as well as the publications that may be issued after the Congress.

It has not been thought expedient to make definite travel arrangements for American scholars. Those who expect to proceed to Oslo from Great Britain are invited to communicate with Mr. Guy Parsloe, Secretary of the Institute of Historical Research, Malet Street, W. C. 1, London.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXIII.—31.

don, who will inform them with regard to any arrangements that may be made for the travel of British scholars, in which Americans are cordially invited to join.

*Bulletins* 3 and 4 of the International Committee of Historical Sciences, containing the proceedings of the annual meeting of the committee held in Göttingen last May, together with reports of committees and much other material, will be issued in January. American scholars are urged to subscribe to the *Bulletin* while it is still possible to secure numbers 1 and 2. The subscription price is \$1 per volume, each volume comprising five issues. Subscriptions may be sent to the treasurer of the International Committee, Waldo G. Leland, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

A revised and illustrated edition of Mr. H. G. Wells's *Outline of History* (see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI. 841, XXXII. 350), published in two volumes in October, 1926, has now been brought out by the Macmillan Company in one volume of 1190 pages, with 700 illustrations, at the price of \$7.50. This, it is to be hoped, will cause many more thousands in America to read that wonderful book.

The October number of the *Historical Outlook* contains the first part of a study, by Professor J. C. Malin of the University of Kansas, of Domestic Policies of the United States since the World War; an article by Professor Carl Wittke of the Ohio State University on Canada's Diamond Jubilee of Confederation; and one by Professor J. M. Gambrill of the Teachers' College of Columbia University on the New World History. The November number includes a paper by H. B. Vinnege of the State Teachers' College of Mayville, N. D., on the Pastoureaux: a Shepherds' Crusade, and the conclusion of Professor Malin's study. The number for December has an informing paper on Secrets of State, by Denys P. Myers, of the World Peace Foundation.

In *History* for October Professor Langlois completes his narrative on the Teaching of History in France; Dr. M. Cary has an article on Athenian Democracy; and W. N. Medlicott a brief note on Lord Salisbury and Turkey.

Vol. II., no. 2, of the *Cambridge Historical Journal* has an excellent portrait of the late Professor Bury and some interesting notes respecting the man. The articles are four: one on Literary Tradition and Early Greek Code-makers, by Professor F. E. Adcock, one on John de Warenne and the Quo Warranto Proceedings in 1279, by Gaillard Lapsley, one on the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Colloquy of Poissy, by H. O. Evannett, and one on Treaties of Guarantee, by J. W. Headlam-Morley.

The second number of *Agricultural History*, published by the Agricultural History Society, contains two articles: Some Historical Relations of Agriculture in the West Indies to that of the United States, by Dr. C. A. Browne, and Egyptian Agricultural Labor under Ptolemy

Philadelphia, by Professor William L. Westermann. Dr. Browne's study, while giving some account of such aboriginal foods of vegetable origin as cassava meal and chocolate, is chiefly devoted to the development of the sugar, indigo, cotton, and coffee industries and their bearing upon the history of the United States. Professor Westermann's paper is concerned with a period of economic as well as political absolutism, agricultural labor being performed by the indigenous population, dominated by Greek and Macedonian agents.

In the inaugural lecture on *The Present Position of History* (Longmans) delivered last October by Dr. George Macaulay Trevelyan, as regius professor of modern history in the University of Cambridge, the reader will find much wisdom and many suggestive thoughts.

*The Berkshire Studies in European History*, planned by Professors Newhall of Williams College, Packard of Amherst, and Packard of Smith, are intended to meet a peculiar pedagogical need in American college classes, namely, the need to furnish the student with a week's "collateral reading" in certain special fields where an assignment of the right length is not readily available. The first four issues to reach us are inexpensive booklets (Holt) on *The Crusades*, by Professor Newhall, on *Europe and the Church under Innocent III.*, by Professor S. R. Packard, on *The Commercial Revolution*, from 1400 to Adam Smith, by Professor L. B. Packard, and on *The Industrial Revolution*, by Professor F. C. Dietz—all intelligently devised and interestingly written.

*Putnam's Historical Atlas, Mediaeval and Modern*, was first issued in 1911. The sixth edition, lately brought out, shows large changes and additions. The form is now quarto; there are 100 pages of text, containing 50 inset maps, and there are 96 engraved plates, containing 229 colored maps and diagrams. The general increase of the book is of quite fifty per cent. The letterpress introduction, by Professor Ramsay Muir and Mr. George Philip of the London Geographical Institute, which has made the maps, has been revised and enlarged. To it is prefixed, somewhat out of place, a treatise on the economic history of the United States, by Professor R. M. McElroy of Oxford, who has supervised the making and improvement of such maps as illustrate American history. There is a very full index. The book is well adapted to be of large use.

*A Syllabus for the History of Civilization* (New York, F. S. Crofts and Co., pp. 213) by Witt Bowden and Roy F. Nichols, assistant professors of history in the University of Pennsylvania, is preceded by a useful body of suggestions for study, for the management of collateral reading, for the making of maps, and on bibliography.

*An Account of Government Document Bibliography in the United States and Elsewhere*, prepared by Mr. James B. Childs, chief of the Division of Documents in the Library of Congress, has been printed

in a pamphlet of thirty-nine pages, which students will find distinctly useful (Washington, Superintendent of Documents, 5 cents).

Gustave Legaret offers an *Histoire du Développement du Commerce depuis la Chute de l'Empire Romain jusqu' à nos Jours* (Paris, Belin, 1927).

The American Numismatic Society has recently published, in its series of *Numismatic Notes and Monographs*, a booklet on the *Earliest Coins of Norway*, by H. A. Parsons, and a more substantial monograph on the *Coinage of Metapontum*, by S. P. Noe (pp. 134 and 23 plates), embracing photographs of several hundred coins, mostly incuse with the symbol of the barley-ear.

The executive secretary of the American Association of Museums, Mr. Laurence B. Coleman, has published through G. P. Putnam's Sons a *Manual for Small Museums* (pp. xiv, 395), abounding in useful suggestions for all departments of museum work—organization, administration, curatorial and educational work, research, and building. The chapter on history collections and exhibits may be especially mentioned here.

The *Concordia Cyclopedia* (St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, pp. 848), edited by Professors L. Fuerbringer, T. Engelder, and P. E. Kretzmann, is an octavo handbook of religious information, having special reference to the history, doctrine, work, and usages of the Lutheran Church. Much valuable information respecting that church, and, to a lesser extent, respecting many other churches and ecclesiastical institutions, is here presented in handy form, but not without prepossessions, especially against Rome.

Two interesting volumes by Mr. W. D. Hambly, assistant curator of African ethnology in the Field Museum, treat with great fullness of knowledge and on the basis of a wide range of material the subjects of *The History of Tattooing and its Significance* (New York, Macmillan, pp. 346) and *Tribal Dancing and Social Development* (*ibid.*, pp. 296).

*Slave Ships and Slaving*, by George F. Dow, no. 15 of the Publications of the Marine Research Society of Salem (pp. xxxviii, 349), a handsome illustrated volume, consists mainly of narratives from Churchill's *Voyages*, Gomer Williams, William Snelgrave, Alexander Falconbridge, Captain Crow, Captain Richard Drake, Edward Manning, and George Howe, quoted at length, and presenting a full account of the business in question, with as many horrors as anyone could desire.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. St. L. B. Moss, *Theories of Civilization* (Quarterly Review, October); Friedrich Meinecke, *Kausalitäten und Werte in der Geschichte* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXVII. 1).

## ANCIENT HISTORY

Mr. E. O. James, author of an esteemed *Introduction to Anthropology* (1910), is now the writer of a small book on *The Stone Age* (London, Sheldon Press, pp. 202), clearly written, intended for the general reader, and representing late information on the facts.

The Oxford University Press has published the first volume of a monumental *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings*, the outcome of some thirty years' labor by Bertha Porter and Rosalind L. B. Moss, to be completed in five volumes, of which the first is devoted to the Theban Necropolis.

*Ur Excavations*, vol. I., *Al-'Ubaid* (Oxford, University Press), by Dr. H. R. Hall of the British Museum and C. L. Woolley, the excavators who have operated under the auspices of that institution and of the University of Pennsylvania, describes the results of the work carried out at Ur in 1919 by Dr. Hall and since 1922 by Mr. Woolley.

*Letters and Transactions from Cappadocia*, more than 200 tablets copied in autograph by the late A. T. Clay, is volume IV. of *Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies* (Yale University).

*A History of the Jewish People*, by Max L. Margolis and Alexander Marx (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society), is to be recommended as an excellent general work on the whole course of Jewish history. A brief but scholarly account of the earlier period of Jewish history is supplied by Norman H. Baynes's *Israel among the Nations; an Outline of Old Testament History* (London, Student Christian Movement). A book of larger importance, *The Legacy of Israel* (Oxford University Press), edited by Drs. Edwyn Bevan and Charles Singer, includes learned and sometimes profound monographs, by high authorities, on Hebrew contributions to civilization, in many aspects.

The late Dr. Israel Abrahams (d. 1925) gave in 1922 the Schweich Lectures before the British Academy, choosing for his subject *Campaigns in Palestine from Alexander the Great*. Mr. Humphrey Milford has now published them for the Academy in a booklet of 55 pages, in which the lecturer treats of the campaigns of Judas Maccabaeus, of Titus, of the Crusades, of Allenby, and less famous campaigns, with the learning of a great scholar, but also with marked insight into strategy.

An eminent French Hellenist, Professor P. Cloché of Besançon, has made a fresh synthesis of *La Civilisation Athénienne* in a small manual (Paris, Colin, 1927, pp. 200).

Students of the development of Greek religion will find value in *Eleusis; die Baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Heiligtumes; Aufnahmen und Untersuchungen* (Berlin, de Gruyter, 1927, pp. x, 334) by Professor Ferdinand Noack of Berlin.



Dr. George F. Hill, keeper of the department of coins and medals in the British Museum, has published through the Paris house of Vanoest a volume of *Select Greek Coins*, embracing 54 collotype plates and illustrating with great perfection the whole history of the subject.

The small book in which Mr. F. M. Cornford treated of the earlier stages of Greek religion has been followed by an excellent little volume on *Later Greek Religion*, by Mr. Edwyn Bevan (London, Dent).

There has been published the third fascicle of the *Histoire Romaine*, vol. I., *Des Origines à l'Achèvement de la Conquête, 133 avant J. C.*, by Ettore Pais, "adapted from the Italian manuscript" by Jean Bayet (Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1927, pp. 160); it forms part of the *Histoire Générale* of Gustave Glotz.

*En Pays Romain* by René Cagnat is a collection of studies, partly descriptive of excavations in Herculaneum, North Africa, and elsewhere, partly reconstructing social conditions in various portions of the Roman world (Paris, Boccard, 1927, pp. 287).

Two considerable works on Pythagoras and his influence are *Études Romaines; la Basilique Pythagoricienne de la Porte Majeure* (Paris, l'Artisan du Livre, 1927, pp. 414) by Jérôme Carcopino and *La Légende de Pythagore; de Grèce en Palestine* (Paris, Champion, 1926, pp. 352) by Isidore Lévy. It may be added that the first volume inaugurates a series of *Études Romaines*, interpreting monuments of antiquity discovered at Rome during and since the World War.

Adolf Schulten, the best authority on ancient Spain, is pre-eminently fitted to make a study of *Sertorius* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1926, pp. 168).

*Der Römische Ritterstand* by Arthur Stein does not discuss questions of imperial administration, but studies in great detail social transformations, particularly the rise of the lower classes (Munich, Beck, 1927, pp. xiii, 500).

In the *Loeb Classical Library* addition has been made of the ninth and final volume of Dio Cassius and the second of eight volumes of Josephus.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Édouard Cuq, *Les Contrats de Karkouk au Musée Britannique et au Musée de l'Irak*, I. (Journal des Savants, August-October); J. Charbonneaux, *L'Empire Perse et l'Occident* (*ibid.*, July); J. Leclercq, *Mycènes et la Civilisation Mycénienne* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres, XIII. 4); Walter Ruppel, *Zur Verfassung und Verwaltung der Amorginischen Städte* (Klio, XXI. 3-4); A. Merlin, *La Sculpture Antique de Phidias à l'Ère Byzantine*, concl. (Journal des Savants, August-October); Leo Weber, *Platons Ἀτλαντικός und sein Urbild* (Klio, XXI. 3 and 4); S. Luria, *Zum Politischen Kampf in Sparta gegen Ende des 5. Jahrhunderts* (*ibid.*); Sir Aurel Stein, *Alexander's Campaign on the India North-West Frontier* (Geographical Journal, November); Luigi Pernier, *Per lo*

*Studio del Tempio Etrusco* (Nuova Antologia, August 16); Reinhold Rau, *Die Oertlichkeit der Helvetierschlacht* (Klio, XXI. 3-4).

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. J. Wilson, *The Career of the Prophet Hermas* (Harvard Theological Review, XX. 1); Erich Caspar, *Kleine Beiträge zur Aelteren Papstgeschichte* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLVI. 3).

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

General review: E. Jordan, *Histoire Ecclésiastique du Moyen Age* (Revue Historique, September).

In the October number of *Speculum* Professor Lynn Thorndike discusses on Some Thirteenth Century Classics, and Mr. J. D. Cook, of the University of Southern California, on Euhemerism: a Medieval Interpretation of Classical Paganism.

*Irish Medieval Monasteries on the Continent* (Catholic University of America, pp. xiii, 121), by Rev. Joseph P. Fuhrmann, is a doctoral dissertation by a Benedictine scholar well versed in Latin sources and German writings, less so in those of the French, who treats of monasteries founded on the Continent for the use of Irish monks, e.g., St. Peter's at Peronne and St. James's at Ratisbon, not without a critical spirit, but without exercising it thoroughly.

Studies preliminary to the expected third volume of Grubmann's *Geschichte der Scholastischen Methode* form a large volume entitled *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* (Munich, Hueber, 1926).

*Tod und Jenseits im Spätmittelalter* (Berlin, Karl Curtius), by Dr. (Frau) E. Döring-Hirsch, treats of many shadowy by-paths, from ecclesiastical doctrines and ceremonies to public executions and the Dance of Death.

The latest of the *Johns Hopkins Studies*, XLV. 3, is a monograph by Professor William K. Gotwald of Wittenberg College, on *Ecclesiastical Censure at the End of the Fifteenth Century*, taking into account all the varied applications of excommunication and interdict.

#### MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

A notable collection of official documents on the separation of church and state in a dozen different countries, furnishing an indispensable guide to the study of this problem, has been presented by Zaccaria Giacometti under the title *Quellen zur Geschichte der Trennung von Staat und Kirche* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1926, pp. xxiv, 736).

No one should hereafter undertake the study of Erasmus's *Colloquies* except with the aid of Professor Preserved Smith's learned and careful tractate in the *Harvard Theological Studies*, entitled *A Key to the Col-*

*loquies of Erasmus*, in which all the early editions put forth in that scholar's lifetime are successively analyzed.

*Renaissance Student Life* (Illinois University Press, pp. 100) presents the *Paedologia* of Petrus Mosellanus, student dialogues (Leipzig, 1518), amusingly translated from Latin into English by Professor Robert F. Seybolt of the university named.

While the career of Margaret of Austria as regent of the Netherlands has been abundantly illustrated by historians, M. Max Bruchet has found in her abundant archives the material for a fresh book on other parts of her career, *Marguerite d'Autriche, Duchesse de Savoie* (Lille, Comité Flamand, 1 rue du Pont Neuf), in which her earlier life at the French court and her brief period as princess of Castile are also treated, though Savoy and Brou have the main place. There are bibliographies of Margaret and of Brou, and an appendix of a hundred documents.

Heinrich Rantzau was a rich sixteenth-century Danish country gentleman, who loaned money to kings and (like the Augsburg Fuggers) maintained a sort of news-service with correspondents in many cities. This chronicle, covering the years 1555-1588 and recounting such events as the Duke of Alva's reign of terror, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the Spanish Armada, is preserved in some one thousand pieces in the Copenhagen Archives, from which a selection has been made by Otto Brandt in his *Heinrich Rantzau und seine Relationen an die Dänischen Könige* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1927, pp. v, 106).

Professor Bernard Faÿ's *L'Esprit Révolutionnaire en France et aux États-Unis à la Fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (reviewed in this journal, XXX. 810), to which was awarded the Jusserand Medal of the American Historical Association in 1926, now appears in an English translation, under the title *The Revolutionary Spirit in France and America: a Study of Moral and Intellectual Relations between France and the United States at the End of the Eighteenth Century* (New York, Harcourt, Brace, and Company, pp. 613). The translation is not so good but that one always perceives that he is reading a French book, but it will cause M. Faÿ's admirable work to be better known and appreciated by those many students of American history who, unfortunately, do not read French.

*Karl Marx, Man, Thinker, and Friend*, is a symposium containing articles by Engels, Lenin, Liebknecht, and others, edited by D. Ryazanoff and published by the International Publishers.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has brought out (*International Conciliation* series, no. 233) *The Genesis of the Universal Postal Union: a Study in the Beginnings of International Organization*, by John F. Sly.

An important contribution to the diplomatic history of the years before the World War is to be expected from Professor Friedrich Meinecke's *Geschichte des Deutschen Bündnisproblems, 1890-1901* (Munich, Oldenbourg, pp. 268).

*L'Alliance Franco-Russe, 1891-1917*, by Georges Michon, is announced as the first complete study of this subject (Paris, Delpeuch, 1927, pp. 320).

Though neither title nor any preface declares it, Miss Esther P. Lovejoy's *Certain Samaritans* (New York, Macmillan) is a record, and a very vivid record, with many telling photographic illustrations, of the activities, 1917-1926, chiefly in the Levant, of the American Women's Hospitals established by the Medical Women's National Association.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Adolf Rein, *Ueber die Bedeutung der Ueberseeischen Ausdehnung für das Europäische Staatensystem* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXVII. 1); Fürst Otto von Bismarck, *Die Mission des Prinzen Wilhelm nach dem Frieden von Tilsit*, I. (Preussische Jahrbücher, October); Paul Müller, *Zur Neugestaltung Mitteleuropas im Jahre 1848; Pläne und Ansichten eines Süddeutschen Diplomaten* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, V. 8); V. Boutenko, *Un Projet d'Alliance Franco-Russe en 1856, d'après des Documents Inédits des Archives Russes* (Revue Historique, July); J. Dontenville, *Les Relations entre la France et l'Italie pendant la Guerre de 1870*, I., concl. (Nouvelle Revue, September 1, 15); W. A. Gauld, *The "Dreikaiserbündnis" and the Eastern Question, 1877-1878* (English Historical Review, October); Hans Uebersberger, *Abschluss und Ende des Rückversicherungsvertrages* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, October); Ange Morre, *La Démocratie Européenne au XX<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, XXXVII.-XXXIX. (Nouvelle Revue, September 1, 15, October 1); Archibald C. Coolidge, *A Quarter Century of Franco-British Relations* (Foreign Affairs, October); Friedrich Stieve, *Neue Dokumente über die Kriegsziele der Entente* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, September); Friedrich Thimme, *Französische Kritiken zur Deutschen Aktenpublikation* (Europäische Gespräche, August-September); William E. Rappard, *The Evolution of the League of Nations* (American Political Science Review, November); D. H. Miller, *The Origin of the Mandates System* (Foreign Affairs, January).

#### THE WORLD WAR

General review: Pierre Renouvin, *Histoire de la Guerre 1914-1918; Ouwrages Publiés de 1925 à 1927* (Revue Historique, September).

In response to a statement of the German Commission of Enquiry into the causes of the German collapse in 1918, to the effect that Belgium departed from neutrality before the war by her erection of fortifications on the Meuse, the Belgian minister of foreign affairs, Mr. E. Vandervelde, has laid before the legislative chambers a *Report* which is available in English (no. 4389, imp. *Moniteur Belge*).

General Hirschauer, who in the early days of the war was chief of staff to General Galliéni and chief of engineers to the Armies of Paris, later in the war commander of the Second Army, and General Klein, who

in 1914 was his assistant, have co-operated in producing a valuable, clearly written, and not too technical account of *Paris en État de Défense, 1914* (Paris, Payot, pp. 412), which gives the reader a full and authoritative account of the preparations for saving Paris, of the battle of the Ourcq, and of the resulting events and arrangements.

The third volume of General J. É. Edmonds's official *Military History of the Great War*, published in late September (Macmillan), gives an account of the winter of 1914-1915, of army organization in that period, and of the battles of Neuve Chapelle and Ypres. The fourth volume of the German official history, *Der Weltkrieg 1914 bis 1918* (Berlin, Mittler), covers the battle of the Marne.

*Field-Marshal Sir Henry Wilson: his Life and Diaries*, by Maj.-Gen. Sir Charles Edward Callwell, which Scribner has brought out, should, as the record of the chief of the Imperial General Staff in the World War, constitute one of the important contributions to the history of the war.

The political and military factors involved in the conduct of French operations in the Near East during the World War are instructively discussed by Robert David in *Le Drame Ignoré de l'Armée d'Orient; Dardanelles, Serbie, Salonique, Athènes* (Paris, Plon, 1927, pp. 361).

Commander Georg von Hase was gunnery officer to the battle-cruiser *Derfflinger* in the Battle of Jutland. His account of that battle, *Kiel and Jutland*, translated into English and published in London by Skeffington, is appraised as one of the best descriptions and narratives of modern naval engagements.

*The Zeppelins*, by Capt. Ernest A. Lehmann and Howard Mingos, is a history of the zeppelin, including an account of its part in the war, especially in the raids on London (J. H. Sears).

The Austrian series of the *Social and Economic History of the World War* is augmented by Cl. Pirquet's *Volksgesundheit im Kriege* (Vienna, 1926, 2 vols., pp. 428, 330) and *Die Regelung der Volksernährung im Kriege* by H. Loewenfeld-Russ (*ibid.*, 1926, pp. 403). In the British series, appears *French Industry during the War* by A. Fontaine (1926, pp. 477); in the French series, *L'Organisation du Travail dans la Région Envahie de la France pendant l'Occupation*, by Pierre Boulin (Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1927, pp. xx, 164); *Le Problème du Logement*, by Henri Sellier and A. Bruggeman (*ibid.*, 1927, pp. xii, 180); in the Belgian series, *L'Action du Gouvernement Belge en Matière Économique pendant la Guerre* (*ibid.*, 1927, pp. xii, 270), by Fernand van Langenhove; in the British series, *The War and the Shipping Industry*, by C. E. Fayle (Yale University Press).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Wickham Steed, *Hommes d'État et Diplomates pendant la Guerre*, I. (*Revue de Paris*, November 1); Harry E. Barnes, *Der Stand der Kriegsschuldfrage* (*Die Kriegsschuldfrage*, August); S. Sazonov, *Les Journées Tragiques de Juillet 1914*, I.,

II. (Revue des Deux Mondes, August 1, 15); Verax, *Le Dichiarazioni di Hindenburg circa la Responsabilità della Guerra* (Nuova Antologia, October 1); anon., *L'Italie et les Responsabilités Austro-Allemandes de la Guerre* (Revue des Deux Mondes, October 1); Alfred von Wegerer, *Die Unterlagen des Versailler Urteils über die Schuld am Ausbruch des Weltkrieges* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, November); T. H. Thomas, *Holland and Belgium in the German War Plan* (Foreign Affairs, January); Gottlieb von Jagow, *Germany's Support of Austria in July, 1914* (Current History, December); Bernadotte E. Schmitt, [criticism of von Jagow's article] (*ibid.*); Adm. Reinhard Scheer, *The Jutland Battle: the German Point of View* (Fortnightly Review, October).

#### GREAT BRITAIN

The *Mariner's Mirror* for July has a discussion of the Hughes-Suffren Campaigns by Vice-Admiral Sir Herbert W. Richmond, adverse to Admiral Ballard's article in the April number. In the October number, besides Admiral Ballard's reply, there is a full account of the History of the Anchor, by Dr. T. Moll, and a useful series of biographical sketches of the judges of the High Court of Admiralty, by William Senior.

The late Sir William Ashley devoted his last days to seeing through the press a volume entitled *Bread of our Forefathers: an Inquiry in Economic History*. The book, based on the Ford Lectures of 1923-1924, has just been published by the Oxford University Press.

*Smith College Studies in History*, XII., presents a body of miscellaneous records of the Norman Exchequer, 1199-1204, edited by Professor Sidney R. Packard.

An important volume on *The Medieval English Sheriff to 1300*, by Professor William A. Morris of the University of California, is published by Longmans, Green, and Company.

*Henry of Pytchley's Book of Fees* (pp. lv, 194, 155), edited by W. T. Mellows for the Northamptonshire Record Society, prints the first half of a manuscript belonging to the dean and chapter of Peterborough cathedral. The present part, after a few miscellaneous documents, deals with the knight's fees of the abbey of Peterborough, presenting in the case of each one a digest of the evidence known to the fourteenth-century compiler relating to the lands held of the abbey by knight's service. Latin original and English translation are placed on opposite pages. The editor gives careful accounts of all known materials respecting the feudal possessions of the abbey and annotates the documents with care.

St. Edmund Hall, which since 1559 has been attached to Queen's College, is the last lineal descendant of the oldest form of academical society designed for the residence of scholars studying in the Oxford schools. Therefore its vice-principal, Mr. Alfred B. Emden, in his



book entitled *An Oxford Hall in Mediaeval Times, being the Early History of St. Edmund Hall* (Clarendon Press, pp. xvi, 320), studies with care not only the history of his own establishment, its principals, its relations to Oseney Abbey, the university, and Queen's College, to the date named, but the early history of academical halls in general, on whose origin he holds views differing largely from those of the late Dean Rashdall.

As a continuation to his former volume, Mr. Hilary Jenkinson of the Public Record Office brings out through the Cambridge University Press *The Later Court Hands in England from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Century* (pp. x, 200, and 66 text-figures), accompanied by a portfolio containing 44 collotype plates. The object is both to provide apparatus for the student and to settle the classification and sketch the history of nine or ten distinct varieties of official writing of the period.

Mr. J. A. Williamson has prepared from original documents a biography of *Sir John Hawkins*, printing in an appendix an account hitherto unused of Hawkins's third slaving voyage, from a Cottonian manuscript.

The National Library of Wales, at Aberystwyth, publishes, as the second volume of its *Calendar of Deeds and Documents*, a volume (pp. 478) of deeds and documents relating to the Crosswood estate in the county of Cardigan, deposited in the library by the Earl of Lisburne. Two or three thousand documents are calendared in chronological order, mostly of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the first half of the nineteenth.

Any scholarly librarian, and also, certainly, any person who plans to found a library or an establishment for scholarly research, will delight in the edition of the *Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James, First Keeper of the Bodleian Library*, which has been published by the Clarendon Press (pp. xlvii, 251) under the editorial care of G. W. Wheeler. The letters, published without arrangement in 1703 in *Reliquiae Bodleianae*, are here presented chronologically, with careful annotations, and with an introduction which tells the story of the founding of the library and of the relations of the founder and librarian in a manner that, in view of all that has grown from that foundation, will seem inspiring to many a reader.

Mr. F. P. Wilson's *The Plague in Shakespeare's London* (Clarendon Press, pp. xii, 228) is a thorough and valuable study, with excellent and interesting illustrations, of the plague of 1603, of that of 1625, and of all the measures taken by the public authorities, the medical profession, and others, to deal with it and its results. Appendixes treat of the bills of mortality and the population of London in the time of James I.

Miss Mabel R. Brailsford, with careful research and in a graceful and attractive style, tells the story of *A Quaker from Cromwell's Army: James Nayler* (New York, Macmillan, pp. 200). Whereas in most

books Naylor is remembered merely by reason of the strange episode of his triumphant entry into Bristol and his subsequent trial, Miss Brailsford shows us, with sympathy and not uncritical admiration, the whole career and the whole man.

The Economic History Society has brought out a reprint of Thomas Mun's *England's Treasure by Foreign Trade*, and a select bibliography of the Industrial Revolution, compiled by the competent hands of Miss Eileen Power.

*The Cambridge Platonists*, by F. J. Powicke, is published by the Harvard University Press.

Sir William Petty left fifty-three chests of documents, of which a part is now preserved by his descendants at Bowood Park. From these the Marquis of Lansdowne now publishes a varied and important selection, in two volumes, *The Petty Papers* (London, Constable). Economics, statistics, liberty of conscience, and public health are the chief topics.

The fourth volume of the Royal Historical Society's series of *British Diplomatic Instructions* contains those sent to ambassadors and envoys in France from 1721 to 1727, derived from the Carteret, Newcastle, and Townshend Papers in the British Museum and from the Public Record Office. The volume is edited by L. G. Wickham-Legg, who, in an introduction of 36 pages, traces carefully the course of Franco-British diplomacy in the later years of George I.

The *Correspondence of King George the Third from 1760 to 1783*, which Sir John Fortescue is editing from the original papers preserved in Windsor Castle, will fill six volumes, of which the first two, covering the period 1760-1773 were published in October by Messrs. Macmillan. The same house also published in that month the second and completing volume of Sir Sidney Lee's life of *King Edward VII*.

Mrs. Edward Stuart Wortley's *A Prime Minister and his Son* (reviewed in this journal, XXXI. 517-519), dealing with Lord Bute and his son Sir Charles Stuart, is continued by a further selection made by her from the family papers of Bute's grandson, Lord Stuart de Rothesay, entitled *Highcliffe and the Stuarts*.

Tooke and Newmarch's *History of Prices and of the State of the Circulation from 1792 to 1856*, long out of print, is being reissued in four volumes by Messrs. P. S. King of London.

Messrs. Heinemann have published from the manuscripts in the British Museum a new edition of *The Greville Diary*, including all the passages hitherto suppressed.

The twelfth volume of Sir John Fortescue's *History of the British Army* (Macmillan) extends from 1839 to 1852, the campaigns of which it treats being mostly in India, but including the operations against the Maoris in 1845-1847, and the Kaffir War.

The third volume of G. D. H. Cole's *Short History of the British Working Class Movement*, bringing the record from 1901 down to the general strike of 1926, was issued in November by the Labour Publishing Company (London).

The first volume of *This Generation: a History of Great Britain and Ireland from 1900 to 1926*, by T. C. Meech, has been published by Dutton.

The Oxford University Press has published this autumn the new volume, edited by Professor H. W. C. Davis and J. R. H. Weaver, supplementary to the *Dictionary of National Biography* and entitled *Twentieth Century Dictionary, 1912-1921*.

The life story of John Alfred Spender, distinguished British journalist, with the title *Life, Journalism, and Politics*, in two volumes, is brought out in New York by Stokes.

An excellent model of local economic history is to be found in *The Economic History of Rossendale*, by Dr. G. H. Tupling (Manchester University Press; New York, Longmans, pp. xxiv, 274). Rossendale is a region of some three boroughs in eastern Lancashire. The pastoral and agricultural development of the Forest of Rossendale, the enclosures and common-land disputes of the sixteenth century, the domestic woollen industry of the seventeenth and eighteenth, the introduction of machinery and the rise of the cotton manufacture, are all narrated with fulness, care, and insight.

Miss Mary Salmon supplies a definite want, though doubtless one felt oftener in Great Britain than here, by *A Source-Book of Welsh History* (Oxford University Press, pp. 301), in which some 160 extracts, mostly short, from chronicles, laws, record books, and letters, illustrate all periods of the political, ecclesiastical, and social life of Wales, from the earliest times to 1535.

The October number of the *Scottish Historical Review* has articles on the Law of the Throne, by G. H. Stevenson, K.C., and one by D. W. Hunter Marshall on Two Early English Occupations in Scotland and the attendant administrative organization, meaning the partial occupation by Henry II. in 1174-1189, and that by Edward I. in 1291-1293.

The *Foreign Correspondence* of Queen Mary of Lorraine during the minority of her daughter having been published by the Scottish History Society in 1925 and 1926, the society has now brought out an interesting and important volume of *The Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine, 1543-1560*, edited by Miss Annie I. Cameron.

British government publications: *Calendar of the Close Rolls*, Henry IV., vol. I., 1399-1402.

Other documentary publications: *Registrum Matthei Parker*, pars septima (Canterbury and York Society).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Samuel Rezneck, *The Early History of the Parliamentary Declaration of Treason* (English Historical Review, October); L. A. Weissberger, *Machiavelli and Tudor England* (Political Science Quarterly, December); W. L. Carne, *A Sketch of the History of the High Court of Chancery from the Chancellorship of Wolsey to that of Lord Nottingham, 1515-1673* (Georgetown Law Journal, November); W. J. P. Wright, *Humanitarian London from 1688 to 1759* (Edinburgh Review, October); A. Aspinall, *The Coalition Ministries of 1827, II. The Goderich Ministry* (English Historical Review, October); A. Mendelssohn Bartholdy, *Staatsmänner und Diplomaten; Lord Lansdowne* (Europäische Gespräche, August-September).

### IRELAND AND THE DOMINIONS

(For Canada, see p. 510; for India, see p. 490.)

In the series called *International Conciliation*, no. 235 is a useful pamphlet on the history and characteristics of Australian immigration policy, by A. H. Charteris, professor of international law in the University of Sydney.

### FRANCE

General reviews: Henri Sée, *Histoire Économique et Sociale, 1926-1927* (Revue Historique, July); Louis Halphen, *Histoire de France; le Moyen Age jusqu' aux Valois* (*ibid.*)

The well-known economic historian, Vicomte Georges d'Avenel, has treated the subject of private property since the Middle Ages in his *Histoire de la Fortune Française; la Fortune Privée à travers Sept Siècles* (Paris, Payot, 1927, pp. 368).

In the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XLVI. 1, Karl Bornhausen, in a valuable review of Henri Brémont's *Histoire Littéraire du Sentiment Religieux en France*, takes marked exception to the treatment of Jansenism.

A *Catalogue des Actes des Archevêques de Bourges, antérieurs à l'An 1200*, has been made by A. Gandilhon (Paris, Champion, 1927, pp. ccxii, 272).

The series *Les Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Age*, edited by Professor Halphen, has in press the second volume of the translation of Bernard Gui's *Practica Officii Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis*; the first volume of a translation of the correspondence (829-862) of Lupus of Ferrières; and the first volume of a translation of the *Chanson de la Croisade Albigeoise*.

Pierre Champion, author of an esteemed book on Villon, is now offering a life of *Louis XI.*, vol. I., *Le Dauphin*, vol. II., *Le Roi* (Paris, Champion, 1927, pp. 240, 412).

All students of French history welcome the announcement of fascicle I. of the *Bibliographie des Travaux publiés de 1866 à 1897 sur l'Histoire de la France de 1500 à 1789*, edited by E. Saulnier and A. Martin and published by the Société d'Histoire Moderne (Paris, Presses Universitaires and Rieder, 1927, pp. 144).

For the series *Les Grandes Études Historiques*, which contains Bainville's *Histoire de France* and Funck-Brentano's *L'Ancien Régime*, Pierre de Vaissière writes a life of *Henri IV.* (Paris, Fayard, 1927, pp. 700).

A distinct contribution to the intellectual history of the Old Régime has been made by Daniel Mornet in *La Pensée Française au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, Colin, 1926, pp. 220).

A general account of France's ventures in the colonial field is furnished by G. Hardy's *Histoire de la Colonisation Française* (Paris, Larose, 1927, pp. 348); perhaps the most famous single episode in this domain is being minutely studied by Alfred Martineau in his *Dupleix et l'Inde Française*, of which we now have vol. III., 1749-1754 (Paris, Société d'Éditions Géographiques, Maritimes, et Coloniales, 1927, pp. xii, 466) and by the same author, *La Politique de Dupleix, d'après sa Lettre à Saunders du 18 Février 1752 et son Mémoire du 16 Octobre 1753* (*ibid.*, 1927, pp. xvi, 136, iv).

*Painted and Printed Fabrics*, published by the Metropolitan Museum of Art, is a history of the French manufacture of painted and printed fabrics from 1760 to 1815, by Henri Clouzot, with notes on cotton printing in England and America by Frances Morris.

In the edition of Rousseau's *Correspondance Générale*, annotated by Théophile Dufour, vol. VII. has been reached, embracing the period of the *Contrat Social* and *Émile*, December, 1761-June, 1762 (Paris, Colin, 1927, pp. viii, 395).

A subject which has lacked adequate special treatment is *La Proscription des Girondins*, the title of a study by G. Lenotre in *Récits d'Autrefois* (Paris, Hachette, 1927).

Albert Meynier proposes to study successively *Les Coups d'État du Directoire*. He has made a beginning in a volume on a subject hitherto insufficiently treated, *Le Dix-Huit Fructidor An V (4 Septembre 1797)* (Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1927, pp. 220).

The brief and tragic life of *L'Aiglon* will no doubt be better known through the publication for the first time of *Papiers Intimes et Journal du Duc de Reichstadt*, from the archives of his preceptor, Count Maurice Dietrichstein. The translator is Étienne Kruger, the editor Jean de Bourgoing (Paris, Payot, 1927, pp. 208).

The series *Figures du Passé*, which contains so many brilliant biographies, is further enriched by J. Lucas-Dubreton's *Le Comte d'Artois; Charles X.* (Paris, Hachette, 1927).

Vol. IV. of Raymond Poincaré's memoirs, *Au Service de la France*, is devoted to *L'Union Sacrée*, 1914 (Paris, Plon, 1927, pp. 552). This will be included in the second volume of the English version, published by Heinemann (London).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Levillain, *De l'Authenticité de la "Clausula de Unctione Pippini"* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, January-June); Marcel Baudot, *La "Clausula de Unctione Pippini" est-elle un Faux du IX<sup>e</sup> Siècle?* (Le Moyen Age, XXVIII. 3-4); R. Crozet, *Le Protestantisme et la Ligue à Vitry-le-François et en Perthois* (Revue Historique, September); Alfred Rébelliau, *Bossuet et les Débuts de Louis XIV.*, I, II. (Revue des Deux Mondes, October 15, November 1); Pierre de Nolhac, *Mme. de Pompadour et la Politique*, I.-IV. (*ibid.*, September 1, 15, October 15, November 1); G. Lacour-Gayet, *Talleyrand à l'Assemblée Constituante* (Revue de Paris, September 1); E. E. Cummins, *Barère, Champion of Nationalism in the French Revolution* (Political Science Quarterly, September); E. Le Marchand, *Hyde de Neuville, Diplomate* [minister to U. S. 1816-1821, to Portugal 1823-1825] (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); Albert Pingaud, *La Politique Extérieure du Second Empire* (Revue Historique, September); Henri Malo, *L'Égérie de M. Thiers; les Cahiers de Mlle. Dosne* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 1); Camille Jullian, *L'École des Chartes et notre Histoire Nationale* (Revue de Paris, August 1).

#### ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General review: Cizam, *Courrier Italien* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October).

The modern Italian viewpoint regarding foreign and domestic matters may to some extent be gauged by two scholarly works, Pietro Silva's *Il Mediterraneo dall' Unità di Roma all' Unità d'Italia* (Milan, Mondadori, 1927, pp. 447) and Gioacchino Volpe's *L'Italia in Cammino; l'Ultimo Cinquantennio* (Milan, Treves, 1927, pp. 278).

Band IV., Teil III., of Dr. Robert Davidsohn's *Geschichte von Florenz* (Berlin, Mittler) concludes the fourth volume of that magisterial work, the volume entitled *Die Frühzeit der Florentiner Kultur*. This part is devoted to a thoroughgoing treatment of ecclesiastical and religious life, and the condition of the city in public and private aspects.

The November *Bulletin* of the Business Historical Society of Boston presents an interesting description of a collection of account-books and letters of the Medici family of Florence, deposited with the society by Mr. H. Gordon Selfridge of London.

Otto Vossler has written of Mazzini's *Politisches Denken und Wollen in den Geistigen Strömungen seiner Zeit* as Beiheft 11 of the *Historische Zeitschrift* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1927, pp. 87).

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXIII.—32.



The Hispanic Society of America has printed in a stout little volume, *George Ticknor: Letters to Pascual de Gayangos* (pp. lxiv, 578), a long series of letters, 1839-1870, which Ticknor addressed to the learned and unassuming scholar who helped him so signally in the preparation of his *History of Spanish Literature*, and which have been presented to the society by the latter's grandson, Don Juan Riaño y Gayangos, formerly Spanish ambassador to the United States. The letters relate almost solely to Spanish books which Ticknor was acquiring through his friend's aid. The student of general, as distinct from literary, history, will find in them only occasional useful touches, such as the statement, in 1851, that "Mérimée is not known in the United States and the *Revue des Deux Mondes* is not taken here" (in Boston). The Civil War appeared to Ticknor as only "this insane struggle for power". An appendix contains more than a hundred pages of Ticknor's notes for the Spanish translation to his learned book. A smaller volume of similar composition, *Prescott: Unpublished Letters to Gayangos*, has also been sent out by the society. Both volumes have interesting illustrations, and excellent notes by Miss Clara L. Penney.

As a basis for the narrative volume of a *Geschichte der Juden im Christlichen Spanien*, Dr. Fritz Baer prints two volumes of documents (Bd. I. and II., Berlin, Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums) collected in Spanish archives and illustrating especially the social conditions out of which arose the brilliant intellectual life of the Spanish Jews.

Fuller knowledge of the views of Juan Valdés is made possible by the publication of his *Diálogo de Doctrina Christiana* with notes by Marcel Bataillon, the discoverer of this long lost work (Coimbra, 1925).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Robert Latouche, *Le Notariat dans le Comté de Nice* (Le Moyen Age, XXVIII. 3-4); G. Volpi di Misurata, *La Repubblica di Venezia e i suoi Ambasciatori* (Nuova Antologia, October 16); Luigi Cavina, *Il Sogno Nazionale di Niccolò Machiavelli in Romagna e il Governo di Francesco Guicciardini* (ibid., August 16); Albert Pingaud, *La Lombardia en 1814* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XLI. 4); M. Schipa, *La Partenza dei Napoletani per la Guerra del 1848; Curiosità tratta da un Manoscritto Inedito* (Nuova Antologia, October 16).

#### GERMANY, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

General review: G. Allemang, *Courrier Allemand* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October).

Teachers of history, especially those interested in the diminution of chauvinism, will find much to engage their attention in Dr. Siegfried Kawerau's very careful and fair-minded *Denkschrift über die Deutschen Geschichts- und Lesebücher, vor allem seit 1923* (Berlin, Hensel).

As the beginning of a new series of *Quellen zur Deutschen Volkskunde*, Messrs. Walter de Gruyter and Company of Berlin publish in German translation, by Dr. George Jacob, a body of quite interesting *Arabische Berichte von Gesandten an Germanische Fürstenhöfe aus den 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, chiefly notes of Ibn Ja'qūb and Tartūschi, envoys to the court of Otto the Great about 973.

Students of church history will profit from the materials in the *Urkundenbuch der Universität Wittenberg*, two parts (1502-1611, 1611-1813), edited by Walter Friedensburg (Magdeburg, Haltermann, 1926, 1927).

Hitherto students of the policy of Frederick the Wise have limited themselves to the period after 1517, overlooking the fact that the elector had already ruled for more than three decades before Luther came into his horizon. Paul Kirn, on the contrary, stresses the earlier years in his *Friedrich der Weise und die Kirche; seine Kirchenpolitik vor und nach Luthers Hervortreten im Jahre 1517, dargestellt nach den Akten im Thüringischen Staatsarchiv zu Weimar* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1926, pp. 212).

Vol. 22 of the great source-collection of *Urkunden und Actenstücke zur Geschichte des Kurfürsten Friedrich Wilhelm von Brandenburg*, edited by Max Hein (succeeding Ferdinand Hirsch, who before his death did the preliminary work on the volume), deals with the elector's relations to Poland, Denmark, Sweden, Brunswick-Lüneburg, and Ostfriesland during the last years of his reign (Berlin and Leipzig, de Gruyter, 1926, pp. x, 606).

*Der Preussische Staat und die Juden*, by Selma Stern (Berlin, Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums) treats in its first two volumes, one of exposition, one of documents, the period of the Great Elector and Frederick I., embracing in its scope the constitutional, political, and economic relations of the Jews of Brandenburg and Prussia to the state.

During the war, French historians regarded German philosophy as responsible for German imperialism. A careful and dispassionate revision of this judgment has been made by Victor Basch in *Les Doctrines Politiques des Philosophes Classiques de l'Allemagne; Leibnitz, Kant, Fichte, Hegel* (Paris, Alcan, 1927, pp. ix, 336).

The life of *August der Starke* by Paul Haake, while not the definitive biography suggested by Droysen as one of the most worth-while topics for an historian, is nevertheless a valuable study, based on many years of archival investigation (Berlin, Paetel, 1926, pp. viii, 244).

The second volume of the correspondence between the great Prussian king and his sister is published as *Friedrich der Grosse und Wilhelmine von Baireuth*, vol. II., *Briefe der Königszeit, 1740-1758*, edited by Gustav

B. Volz (Berlin, Koehler, 1926). The edition contains 225 more letters than that of the *Oeuvres*.

Though the Rothschild family is linked so closely with European politics throughout the whole nineteenth century, no complete account of its history has hitherto appeared. This gap is now to be filled by the competent historian Dr. Egon Cäsar Conte Corti, the first part of whose work, *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Rothschild, 1770-1830*, has just appeared (Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1927). The second and concluding portion is promised for the fall of 1928.

An example of the present-day interest in the opinions almost more than in the deeds of historical personalities is afforded by Erich Botzenhart's book on *Die Staats- und Reformideen des Freiherrn vom Stein; ihre Geistigen Grundlagen und ihre Praktischen Vorbilder*, part I., *Die Geistigen Grundlagen* (Tübingen, Osiander, 1927, pp. vii, 251).

The Prussian Kulturkampf has been described in detail chiefly from the church standpoint. The viewpoint of the state during that crisis is told on the basis of unpublished documents by Erich Foerster in *Adalbert Falk; sein Leben und Wirken als Preussischer Kultusminister* (Gotha, Klotz, 1927, pp. xvi, 712).

Two volumes published by the Schlözer family, *Amerikanische Briefe* and *Letzte Römische Briefe* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt), record the experiences of an accomplished diplomatist who was minister of the North German Confederation in Mexico in 1869 and first minister of the German Empire to the Holy See in 1882-1892.

*Die Verfassungsbestrebungen des Landesausschusses für Elsass-Lothringen, 1875-1911*, have been described by Fritz Bronner (Heidelberg, Winter, 1926).

The dominant military conception of the old German General Staff, i.e., the speedy overwhelming of France by a great encircling operation involving the violation of Belgium's neutrality, is critically studied and approved by Wilhelm Groener in *Das Testament des Grafen Schlieffen* (Berlin, Mittler, 1927, pp. 244).

The late Hugo Preuss, to whom more than to any other the groundwork of the present German constitution is due, labored during the last years of his life on a great *Staatsrecht der Deutschen Republik*, which was to furnish an historical introduction and a commentary to the constitution. Such portions of his commentary as he completed are shortly to be published. The historical section, beginning with the fall of the Hohenstaufens, had reached the eighteenth century at the time of his death in 1925. This is now offered under the title *Verfassungspolitische Entwicklungen in Deutschland und Westeuropa*, edited by Hedwig Hintze (Berlin, Heymann, 1927, pp. xx, 488). It is obviously of great importance to students of the present German government, desirous of better understanding Preuss's political philosophy.

An important contribution to the history of the social religious movement in Germany is found in the first volume of a life of Wichern by Martin Gerhard (Hamburg, Rauhes Haus, 1927).

*The Making of a State*, by President T. G. Masaryk, put into English by H. Wickham Steed, is a valuable and classical account of the processes by which that intellectual statesman brought the republic of Czechoslovakia into existence.

The *Archiv des Historischen Vereins des Kantons Bern*, XXIX. 1, consists chiefly of a long monograph (pp. 149) by Dr. Edgar Bonjour, on "Die Schweiz und Savoyen im Spanischen Erbfolgekrieg".

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Ernst Nischer, *Die Schlacht bei Strassburg im Jahre 357 n. Chr.* (Klio, XXI. 3-4); Martin Lintzel, *Heinrich I. und das Herzogtum Schwaben* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, September); Hans Hirsch, *Reichskanzlei und Reichspolitik im Zeitalter der Salischen Kaiser* (Mitteilungen des Oesterreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung, XLII. 1 and 2); Paul Kalkoff, *Die Stellung der Deutschen Humanisten zur Reformation* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLVI. 2); C. Erdmann, *Ferdinand I. und die Kreisverfassung* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, September); Richard Fester, *Politisch-Militärische Lehren des Politischen Testamentes Friedrichs des Grossen von 1768* (Deutsche Rundschau, August); Gerhard Ritter, *Die Staatsanschauung des Freiherrn vom Stein; ihr Wesen und ihre Wurzeln* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, V. 7); Kurt Borries, *Vom Werdegang Rankes bis zum Antritt seiner Berliner Professur* (ibid.); Gustav Roloff, *Brünn und Nikolsburg: nicht Bismarck sondern der König isoliert* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXVI. 3); Eckart Kehr, *Die Deutsche Flotte in den neunziger Jahren und der Politisch-Militärische Dualismus des Kaiserreichs* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, V. 9); Hermann Lutz, *Moltke und der Präventivkrieg*, I.; Theobald von Schäfer, *Erwiderung* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, November); Arnold Berney, *Die Hochzeit Josephs I.* (Mitteilungen des Oesterreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung, XLII. 1 and 2); Olof Oijer, *Le Comte d'Aehrenthal et ses Méthodes Diplomatiques* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XLI. 4); Marcel Dunan, *Les Étapes de la Crise Autrichienne* (Revue de Paris, September 15).

#### NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

As the beginning of a series intended to illustrate all the sources of language and law in Friesland proper, Mr. P. Sipma publishes the first of three volumes of *Oudfriesche Oorkonden* (the Hague, Nijhoff, pp. xvi, 392), filled with documents relating to private individuals.

The student of the history of the Merchant Adventurers will find much material for his purposes in the latest volume published by the Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht, a collection of documents, chiefly of 1616-1644, on *De Nationale Organisatie der Lakenkoopers tijdens de Republiek* (Utrecht, Kemink, pp. lx, 370).

Two new publications in the series of *Rijksgeschiedkundige Publicatiën*, issued by the Dutch Historical Commission (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1926) are *The Dispatches of Thomas Plott and Thomas Chudleigh*, English envoys at the Hague, edited by Professor F. A. Middlebush of the University of Missouri, and dealing with difficult negotiations in 1682, and the first volume (1808-1833, but chiefly 1828-1833) of *Groen van Prinsterer, Schriftelijke Nalatenschap: Briefwisseling*, edited by Dr. C. Gerretson, and illustrating in great fullness, for its period, the life of one who was in his time a great political figure and also did great services to Dutch history.

The second volume of the late Professor Lonchay's *Correspondance de la Cour d'Espagne sur les Affaires des Pays-Bas au XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, continued by Joseph Cuvelier, and, like its predecessor, published by the Belgian Academy (pp. xiv, 797, quarto), contains a calendar of the correspondence of Philip IV. with his aunt the Infanta Isabella, regent of the Spanish Netherlands, from 1621, the year in which the Archduke Albert died, to the time of her own death in 1633. 2189 letters or despatches, some of them from Simancas and Madrid, more of them from the Belgian archives, are summarized, in such a way as to illustrate fully the extraordinary difficulties of Isabella's regency.

At the time of his death in 1916, Professor Godefroid Kurth had somewhat more than half finished an edition for the Belgian Commission Royale d'Histoire of the *Chroniques des Evêques de Liège* of Jean de Hocsem, a most important source for Belgian history of the period from 1247 to the author's death in 1348. Afterward completed by Dom Ursmer Berlière and Professor Jules Closon of Liège, this excellent edition is now published in a handsome volume (Brussels, Kiessling, pp. lxxv, 445).

#### NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

In an Uppsala doctoral dissertation, *Gustaf IV. Adolf och Sveriges Utrikespolitik, 1801-1804* (Uppsala, Appelberg, pp. xix, 301), Dr. Herbert Lundh traces the course, and the economic and political motives, of the process by which Sweden moved forward from the Armed Neutrality of 1800 to her readiness to enter into the Third Coalition. Another dissertation from the same university, by Dr. Knut Wichman, on *Karl XIV. Johans Regering och den Liberala Oppositionen under 1830-talets senare Hälft* (Göteborg, Pehrsson, pp. xiv, 243), traces the growth of the Liberal opposition from 1837 to its victory in 1840.

Ground has been broken in a new field by Jan Rutkowski's *Histoire Économique de la Pologne avant les Partages* (Paris, Champion, 1927, pp. 268).

• *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (New York, Knopf), by William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, first published in 1920, appears now in a second edition, of five volumes, largely documentary

in character, but with extensive introductions on the methods of sociological study which the collection is destined to serve, and on the inferences to be drawn from the documents respecting the evolution of peasant organization under the influences of the new industrial system and of immigration to America and Germany. The documents, mainly letters and court records, cover a very wide range.

From Professor G. V. Vernadsky, of Yale, we receive a volume of *Natchertanie Russkoi Istorii* [Outlines of Russian History] (Clamart, dép. Seine, Eurasie, pp. 264).

A *History of Russia*, in one volume, from the highly competent pen of Professor Sir Bernard Pares, is published in London by Jonathan Cape.

The reminiscences of Sazonov, Russian Foreign Minister at the time of the outbreak of war in 1914, have been published in London in translation this autumn by the same firm under the title *Fateful Years*.

*The Tragic Bride*, by V. Poliakoff, is the story of the Empress Alexandra of Russia, and the part she played in bringing the revolution to a head (Appleton).

In a volume published by Appleton, and called *The Catastrophe*, Alexander Kerensky gives his highly important story of the period from the first to the second Russian revolution.

In late December there was added to the Century Historical Series a volume of *Documents of Russian History, 1914-1917*, by Professor Frank A. Golder of Stanford University, presenting official documents, newspaper clippings, and extracts from diaries and letters and speeches which help to a fuller understanding of the disintegration of the Empire and the course of revolution.

An historical account of the effect of the revolution on the Russian Church by Matthew Spinka is published by Macmillan under the title *The Church and the Russian Revolution*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: N. Brian Chaninov, *La Russie et la Catholicité durant le Moyen Age* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); S. R. Mintzloff, *The Decline and Fall of the Russian Empire* (Current History, December); Sir Bernard Pares, *Rasputin and the Empress* (Foreign Affairs, October); Prince Youssoupoff, *La Fin de Raspoutine*, I.-III. (Revue de Paris, October 1, 15, November 1); Graf Alfred Waldersee, *Die Lage in den Russischen Randländern zu Anfang 1918* (Preussische Jahrbücher, August); George Soloveytchik, *Ten Years of Bolshevism* (Nineteenth Century and After, November); *Ten Years of Bolshevism: a Symposium* (Current History, November).

#### SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

In *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke*, by Franz Babinger (Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1927, pp. viii, 477), the attempt has



for the first time been made to give a complete bio-bibliographical account of Ottoman historical literature in the three Islamic languages from the beginnings to the collapse of the empire.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Gregor Peradse, *Die Anfänge des Mönchtums in Georgien* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLVI. 1); Hans Petri, *Jakobus Basilikus Heraklides, Fürst der Moldau* (ibid.); Alessandro de Bosdari, *Lo Scoppio della Guerra Balcanica visto da Sofia* (Nuova Antologia, September 1); R. J. Kerner, *The Mission of Liman von Sanders*, II. (Slavonic Review, December).

#### ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

General review: A. Vincent, *Chronique d'Histoire Orientale* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October).

The American Geographical Society has undertaken the publication of a series entitled *Oriental Explorations and Studies*, the first six volumes of which will present the results of Professor Alois Musil's explorations in Arabia and Mesopotamia, 1908-1915. Two volumes are now available; the remaining four will appear within the course of eighteen months or two years. While the text consists of narratives of expeditions and descriptions of present-day conditions, appendixes contain discussions of many points of historical interest. Many passages from Assyrian, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Arabic documents relating to Northern Arabia and Mesopotamia are paraphrased in English and critically examined. In the two volumes that have appeared to date, the *Northern Heḡâz* and *Arabia Deserta*, there is much of value to the Biblical scholar. Professor Musil also aims to reconstruct the ancient, medieval, and modern pilgrim and trade routes through Northern Arabia. The appendixes of forthcoming volumes will include, among other matters, an examination of the probable routes of Xenophon and of the emperor Julian in Mesopotamia; detailed notes on Roman roads and on Roman Byzantine settlements in Palmyrene; and much material on the historical geography of Arabia during the Middle Ages and later times.

For those who read Hebrew, an important addition to the literature of travel in the Levant is presented by *Ozar Massaoth: a Collection of Itineraries by Jewish Travellers in Palestine, Syria, Egypt, and other Countries*, selected and edited by J. D. Eisenstein (New York, 57 East Broadway), and embracing twenty-four narratives of all dates from Benjamin of Tudela (1165) down through the Middle Ages and modern times to Dr. Louis Loewe (1838) and Judith Lady Montefiore (1839).

The second edition of *A History of Hindu Political Theories*, by Professor U. N. Ghoshal, of Presidency College, Calcutta, of which the first edition was reviewed in this journal four years ago (XXIX. 367), differs from the earlier publication by extension to the end of the seven-

teenth century, instead of 1625, and by some revision, due to the better publication of the *Arthashastra* of Koutilya and other sources.

The Government Press of Madras has published the eleventh volume of the *Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai* (pp. xxi, 488), translated from the Tamil.

A volume of *Warren Hastings's Letters to Sir John Macpherson*, edited by Professor Henry Dodwell from the originals in the possession of Macpherson's family, has been published by Faber and Gwyer of London.

Mr. P. E. Pieris and Fräulein M. A. H. Fitzler have begun the illustration of the history of Ceylon under Portuguese rule by a collection of translations from original documents at Lisbon, entitled, *Ceylon and Portugal*, part I., *Kings and Christians, 1530-1552* (Leipzig, Verlag der *Asia Major*).

Messrs. Routledge have lately added to their series of *Broadway Travellers* a new edition of Father Huc's *Travels in Tartary, Thibet, and China*, with an introduction by Professor Paul Pelliot of Paris, and Lescarbot's *Nova Francia*, edited by Dr. H. P. Biggar.

In an earlier work, *Fêtes et Chansons de la Chine Ancienne*, Marcel Granet reconstituted the customs and beliefs of primitive rural China, abolished by the later feudal, urban civilization. His new book, *Danses et Légendes de la Chine Ancienne*, gives a picture of the origins from which this later society sprang (Paris, Alcan, 1926, 2 vols., pp. 710).

In a handsome quarto monograph of 75 pages and twenty heliotype plates Professor Mikhail Rostovtzeff describes *Inlaid Bronzes of the Han Dynasty in the Collection of C. T. Loo* of Paris (Paris and Brussels, G. Vanoest), endeavoring by acute and learned analysis to illustrate the relation of these objects to Greek, Parthian, and Indo-Scythian art, and to the animal style which he has called Sarmatian.

*China and Foreign Powers: an Historical Review of their Relations* (Oxford University Press), now published as an octavo booklet of 78 pages, is a memorandum drawn up by Sir Frederick Whyte for the British delegation at the conference held last July at Honolulu by the Institute of Pacific Relations. The memorandum is accompanied by several documents illustrative of the British attitude toward the subject in 1840, 1921, 1926, and 1927.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Vittore Pisani, *Le Invasioni Indoeuropee dell' Asia* (Nuova Antologia, August 16); Prince Nicolas of Greece, *La Campagne d'Asie Mineure* (Revue de Paris, August 1).

#### AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

The magistral *Histoire Ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord* by Professor Stéphane Gsell of the Collège de France has received two new

volumes, both concerning themselves with *Les Royaumes Indigènes*, in regard to which vol. V. treats the *Organisation Sociale, Politique, et Économique*, while vol. VI. studies the *Vie Matérielle, Intellectuelle, et Morale* (Paris, Hachette, 1927).

Between the ancient period of North African history and that since the twelfth century, both periods comparatively well known, lies the obscure period in which Islam triumphed and in which the Kharejite and Kabyle kingdoms and the Fatimite caliphate rose and fell. On this period Professor E. F. Gautier, of the University of Algiers, treats with a learned and vivid pen in *Les Siècles Obscurs du Maghreb* (Paris, Payot, pp. 432).

#### AMERICA

Among recent accessions of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress are: correspondence of Augustus Saint Gaudens, 1891-1913 (one volume); additions to the Grover Cleveland Papers (restricted as to investigation); photostat copies of 12 letters of Abraham Lincoln (scattered by a recent auction sale); reports of the marine committee of the Continental Congress, 1775-1781 (39 reports, all spread upon the Journals of Congress); a contemporary copy of the Journal of Congress, May 10-July 26, 1775; and an account of commissions for privateers received and forwarded to the several states, 1780-1783 (41 pieces).

Messrs. Little, Brown, and Company of Boston offer a prize of \$2500, in addition to book royalties, for the best unpublished work on American history, suitable for publication as a single volume of from 80,000 to 130,000 words, written in popular form yet constituting a genuine contribution to knowledge. All manuscripts must be submitted to the publisher before October 1, 1928, marked "History Prize Competition". The successful manuscript, and perhaps others, will be published. All manuscripts must be carefully typewritten on one side of the paper only. The judges will be Messrs. James Truslow Adams, Worthington C. Ford, and Allan Nevins. Inquiries as to details should be addressed, "History Prize Competition, Little, Brown, and Company, 34 Beacon Street, Boston".

Professor Carl L. Becker has brought out through Harper and Brothers a volume entitled *Our Great Experiment in Democracy: a History of the United States*.

*American Parties and Politics: History and Rôle of Political Parties in the United States*, by Harold R. Bruce, appears in the American Political Science Series (Holt).

Dr. Hendrik Willem Van Loon has done a volume on *America*, after the manner of his *Story of Mankind* (New York, Liveright).

Father Rob. Streit, director of the Missionary Library at the Vatican, has undertaken a complete bibliography of works relating to the history

of Catholic missions: relations of voyages, decisions of popes and congregations, decrees of religious superiors, acts of governments and governors, etc. The first part, giving the general literature, appeared in 1916. Volumes II. and III. deal with America, embracing 5600 titles. They appear as *Bibliotheca Missionum*, vol. II., *Americanische Missions-literatur, 1493-1699*; vol. III., id., *1700-1909* (Aix-la-Chapelle, Missionsdruckerei, 1925, 1927, pp. xxxii, 970; xxix, 1172). Three volumes in preparation will give the literature concerning Africa, Asia, and Oceanica.

The June issue of the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society contains the concluding installment of Rev. Edward P. Curley's study of the Origin and Progress of the Catholic Church in Montana; a sketch (unsigned) of Marc Antony Frenaye (1783-1873); and an address, by Hon. Michael J. Ryan, on Old St. Mary's.

Vol. II. of the *Studies and Records* of the Norwegian-American Historical Association opens with a body of translations of Norwegian Emigrant Songs, translated and edited by Professor Martin Ruud. This is followed by an elaborate account of passengers on the four vessels, of 1836-1837, which brought the first Norwegian immigrants after those of the *Restauration* (1825). Professor H. J. Cadbury has recovered their names from the records of the New York custom-house. There is also an "America" letter of 1869; a paper by Professor Laurence M. Larson on the Norwegian Pioneer in the Field of American Scholarship; and a full statement by G. T. Flom of the history and present status of courses on the Norwegian Language and Literature in American Universities. The society is supporting an investigation by Professor Knut Gjerset on the contributions of Norwegian Americans to the development of shipping on the Great Lakes. The society has also brought out, as vol. II. of its "Travel and Description Series", a pamphlet of 60 pp. presenting Norwegian text and English translation of Peter Testman's *Kort Beskrivelse* (Stavanger, 1839), *Short Account of the Most Important Experiences during a Sojourn in North America*, translation and historical introduction by Professor Theodore C. Blegen.

A revised edition of Lippincott's useful *Economic Development of the United States* (reviewed *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 583), including the history of the remarkable development of trade and industry since the close of the World War, particularly of the change in the status of agriculture, of railroads, of foreign trade, and of the new relations growing out of the settlements with the debtor nations of Europe, has been brought out by D. Appleton.

In the volume entitled *Political and Industrial Democracy, 1776-1926* (New York, Funk and Wagnalls), Dr. W. Jett Lauck, formerly professor of economics in Washington and Lee University, describes with much fullness and fairness the various efforts in this country since the

World War to substitute industrial democracy for autocratic rule in industries, and the outstanding examples of employee representation and co-operation.

*The Story of Architecture in America*, by Thomas E. Tallmadge, is a nontechnical history of American architecture and architects from colonial times to the present (New York, W. W. Norton).

In a quarto monograph of 47 pages and twenty-one plates, issued at New York by the American Numismatic Society, Mr. Bauman L. Belden gives the history of *Indian Peace Medals issued in the United States*, treating of medals issued by governmental authority from 1789 to 1889, and of medals of fur-trading companies.

The Rev. Dr. William Elliot Griffis has brought out this autumn a small volume on *The American Flag of Stripes and Stars*, an attempt at a critical history of its forms and uses and of legislative and executive acts for its regulation.

A retired Latin professor of Yale, Dr. Edward P. Morris, makes an interesting, authoritative, and well-illustrated volume on the technical subject of *The Fore-and-Aft Rig in America* (New Haven, Yale University Press).

Professor Robert D. Leigh's *Federal Health Administration in the United States* (Harper, pp. 687), while mainly descriptive, has portions of an historical sort relating to the national medical care of army and navy, merchant seamen, and territorials, quarantine, and various relations of the federal system to those of the states.

#### ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

A decidedly sensational thesis is set forth by Luis Ulloa, former director of the national library of Lima, Peru, in *Christophe Colomb Catalan; la Vraie Genèse de la Découverte de l'Amérique* (Paris, Maisonneuve, pp. 416). The book is announced as summarizing Benedictine researches of more than a quarter of a century. More orthodox, but also of considerable interest, is *La Correspondance du Savant Florentin Paolo dal Pozzo Toscanelli avec Christophe Colomb* by N. Sumien (Paris, Soc. d'Éditions Géographiques, Maritimes, et Coloniales, pp. x, 114).

In a small edition (172 copies, at \$66.50 each), Paul Gottschalk of Berlin publishes *The Earliest Diplomatic Documents on America*, namely, the four papal bulls of 1493 and the treaty of Tordesillas, with introduction and notes by himself—some 84 pages of text and 130 plates printed by the Reichsdruckerei in Berlin.

*The Gateway to American History* (Boston, Little, Brown, and Company, pp. xv, 174), by Professor Randolph G. Adams of the William L. Clements Library, is as respects its text intended (and excellently

adapted) for children's reading, but the illustrations, on which the text is but a commentary, may well hold the attention of even instructed adults, so well are they selected and reproduced from the rare books of the period of voyages and discoveries which are in Mr. Adams's custody.

*Captain John Smith*, by Edward K. Chatterton, is a new biography of the great explorer, which appears in the Golden Hind Series (Harper).

From the late Dr. Thwaites's monumental edition of *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (73 vols., 1896-1901) Miss Edna Kenton has drawn off those letters and parts of letters in which the Jesuit missionaries describe the Indians, their polity and religion, their ways and wars, *The Indians of North America* (New York, Harcourt, Brace, and Company, two vols., pp. xvii, 597, xv, 579). Sixty-eight of Dr. Thwaites's 238 documents are represented in this compilation, and his historical introduction to his famous series is reprinted at the end of vol. II. The volumes are a rich and convenient storehouse of observations by highly intelligent observers. Some twenty maps are reproduced, not very legibly.

Students of Washington and his times have long appreciated the value of the late W. S. Baker's *Itineraries*, giving day-by-day accounts of Washington's position and movements from 1775 to 1783, and from that date to his death. Now Dr. J. C. Fitzpatrick, of the Library of Congress, completes such record by a volume similarly organized, called *George Washington, Colonial Traveller* (Bobbs-Merrill, pp. xv, 416), in which Washington's movements are followed and dated, so far as is possible, from 1732 to 1774.

A full account of Washington's will and all its implications is given by Mr. Eugene E. Prussing in *The Estate of George Washington, Deceased* (Boston, Little, Brown and Co., pp. 490).

Professor C. H. Van Tyne's lectures delivered last spring on the Sir George Watson Foundation are now published by the Cambridge University Press (New York, Macmillan) in a volume entitled *England and America, Rivals in the American Revolution*.

*1776: a Day-by-Day Story*, by Jonathan Rawson (New York, Frederick A. Stokes Company, pp. x, 429) is the product of an attempt to supply a syndicate of newspapers with a news-letter during each day of 1926 such as might have been written in 1776 detailing the important news of that day. The news-letters are prepared with excellent knowledge and care and judgment, and will give many readers excellent historical reading and a vivid sense of what was going on in that memorable year, as seen with the eyes of the time.

The William L. Clements Library at the University of Michigan has made a highly important accession through the acquisition of the papers of Lord George Germain.



Mr. Harold Murdock publishes in a limited edition a new illustrated book on *Bunker Hill: Notes and Queries on a Famous Battle* (Houghton Mifflin).

Dr. M. M. Quaife, of the Detroit Public Library, in a volume entitled *The Capture of Old Vincennes* (Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, pp. xxii, 231), has brought together the *Memoir* which George Rogers Clark prepared for Madison, relating the history of his conquest of the Northwest, and Colonel Henry Hamilton's report to Haldimand concerning the same events. The text of the former is the version "in simple grammatical English" made by Dr. Quaife for the series of the *Lakeside Classics*, and, with Dr. Quaife's excellent introduction and notes, makes this heroic story legible without difficulty to readers unversed in the interpretation of old manuscripts.

A well-documented account of the many important commercial and financial transactions of Dutch business men and bankers with America, during the Revolutionary War and down to Hamilton's funding of the national debt, is presented in a volume by P. J. van Winter, published by the society having charge of the Dutch Economic-Historical Archives, *Het Aandeel van den Amsterdamschen Handel aan den Opbouw van het Amerikansche Gemeenebest* (the Hague, Nijhoff, pp. xxvi, 240).

As Beiheft 12 to the *Historische Zeitschrift* appears a monograph on *Die Staatsidee Alexander Hamiltons in ihrer Entstehung und Entwicklung* (Munich, Oldenbourg), by Alex Bein.

A volume on *The Spanish-American Frontier, 1783-1795*, the fruit of prolonged study in this country and in Spain, by Professor Arthur P. Whitaker, was published this autumn by the Houghton Mifflin Company.

Little, Brown, and Company have brought out the correspondence of John Adams with Benjamin Waterhouse, 1784-1822, edited by Worthington C. Ford, in a volume entitled *Statesman and Friend*.

The State Department has recently sent to the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office, to be placed on sale, a certain number of copies of its *Calendar of Miscellaneous Letters, 1789-1820*, a volume formerly regarded as confidential. Libraries may now acquire it.

A. and C. Boni have published a new edition of *The Journal of William Maclay, United States Senator from Pennsylvania, 1789-1791* (New York, Appleton, 1890), with an introduction by Professor Charles A. Beard.

Among the principal articles in the *Catholic Historical Review* for October is one of 76 pages, by Professor Lawrence M. Flick, on Prince Gallitzin, whose notable career as a priest in America is fully set forth.

Meade Minnigerode has brought together biographical sketches of Stephen Girard, John Jacob Astor, Jay Cooke, Daniel Drew, Cornelius

Vanderbilt, Jay Gould, and James Fisk, to which he has given the general title *Certain Rich Men* (Putnam).

The correspondence of Lewis Tappan and others with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, edited by Mrs. Abel and Professor Klingberg, which has been mentioned in these pages as bulking large in the recent numbers of the *Journal of Negro History*, has been brought together as a book, *A Side-Light on Anglo-American Relations, 1839-1858* (Washington, Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, pp. vii, 407).

*A Pioneer of 1850* (Boston, Little, Brown, and Company) is the record of a journey made by a young physician, George Willis Read, from Independence, Mo., to the gold fields of California in 1850, and of a voyage on the *Ariel* from New York to California by way of Panama in 1862, during which the *Ariel* was captured by the *Alabama*. The entertaining narratives are edited with affectionate care by his daughter, Georgia Willis Read, and supplied with many good illustrations.

*Commodore Vanderbilt: an Epic of American Achievement*, is from the pen of Arthur D. H. Smith and the press of McBride.

In *Abraham Lincoln: the Tribute of the Synagogue* (New York, Bloch Publishing Company, pp. xxi, 682), Emanuel Hertz has composed a useful and interesting book by bringing together some eighty Jewish addresses relating to Lincoln and exhibiting fully the estimate of his character and career current among Jews. Most of the addresses are by rabbis. The first thirty, which are commemorative pieces of the year 1865, were recovered by Mr. Hertz through much painstaking search. A few of the discourses are printed in German. Portraits and facsimiles of the title-pages illustrate the book.

*Abraham Lincoln: the Pardon of the Sleeping Sentinel*, by Allen C. Clark, is a minute illustrated account of a Civil War episode.

In *Lincoln and the Railroads* John W. Starr, jr., has presented Lincoln as a railroad attorney and traveller (Dodd).

*Fighting by Southern Federals* is the title of a volume by C. C. Anderson, 319 South Third Street, Richmond, Va. While the main theme of the work is to show the extent to which the Federal army drew its fighting forces, privates and officers, from the South, the author reviews in some detail the whole course of the war.

James K. P. Scott, a survivor of Gettysburg, has undertaken to tell *The Story of the Battles of Gettysburg* in three volumes of which the first has appeared (Harrisburg, the *Telegraph* Press).

*Marching with Sherman* is the title of a volume embodying selections from the letters and campaign diaries of Henry Hitchcock, major and assistant adjutant-general of volunteers, November, 1864, to May, 1865.

The volume is edited, with an introduction, by M. A. De Wolfe Howe and published by the Yale University Press.

The University of North Carolina press has brought out Walter L. Fleming's *Freedmen's Savings Bank*, an expansion of the paper prepared for the 1905 meeting of the American Historical Association and published in the *Yale Review* in 1906.

A biography of Horace Porter, Civil War veteran and ambassador to France, entitled *An American Soldier and Diplomat*, by Elsie P. Mende and H. G. Pearson, has been published by Stokes.

The reminiscences of Joseph G. Cannon, speaker of the national House of Representatives, as told to his secretary, L. W. Busbey, have been published by Messrs. Holt, with the title *Uncle Joe Cannon*.

The first two of the five volumes of *The Life and Letters of Woodrow Wilson*, by Ray Stannard Baker, the authorized biography, was published on November 12 by Doubleday, Page.

Mary V. Pennington and John R. Bolling have compiled a volume to which they have given the title *Chronology of Woodrow Wilson*. It is a chronological arrangement of the important days of Wilson's career, with the inclusion of notable addresses, a brief description of the League of Nations and of the Covenant (New York, Stokes).

*Joseph Pulitzer, his Life and Letters*, by Don Carlos Seitz, is from the press of the Garden City Publishing Company.

T. G. Frothingham's *American Reinforcement in the World War* is a description of how the United States recruited, equipped, and transported a great army in a short time. There is a short introduction by Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War during the Wilson administration, and several maps and diagrams (Doubleday).

#### LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

##### NEW ENGLAND

In this month of January appears the first number of a journal entitled *The New England Quarterly: an Historical Review of New England Life and Letters*. New England has had so distinctive a place in American history and literary and social life, and so much unity of form and spirit, that such an endeavor is wholly to be justified and commended. The first number is announced as to contain papers on "Squire Ames and Doctor Ames", by Professor Samuel E. Morison of Harvard University; a Journal of Village Life in Vermont in 1848, edited by Wilson O. Clough; the Genesis of Godey's *Lady Book*, by Lieut.-Colonel Lawrence Martin of the Library of Congress; a Ballad of the Northwest Fur Trade, by Judge F. W. Howay of British Columbia, and reviews of a small selected group of books. Dr. Lawrence S. Mayo is the managing editor, the other editors being Professors S. E. Morison, A. M.

Schlesinger, Kenneth B. Murdock, and Stanley Williams. Subscriptions are to be sent to the Williams and Wilkins Company of Baltimore.

Professor Hall's *Benjamin Thompson, His Poems* (1924), is now followed by Kenneth B. Murdock with a further book of poems of that period, largely unpublished, from the pens of Benjamin Thompson, Rev. John Wilson, and others, *Handkerchiefs from Paul* [the phrase is taken by the editor from Acts xix. 12], *being Pious and Consolatory Poems of Puritan Massachusetts* (Harvard University Press, pp. lxxiii, 134). Mr. Murdock prefixes a learned introduction.

Mr. Thomas J. Holmes, librarian of the William Gwinn Mather Library, of Cleveland, has privately printed a lecture on *The Mather Literature*, describing the fourteen largest collections of such material, twelve of them in the United States, the largest being those of the American Antiquarian Society and the Mather Library.

It is agreeable to see important additions to the materials for the relatively neglected maritime history of the Revolution. Dr. Gardner W. Allen has made a signal contribution to such material by editing for the Massachusetts Historical Society, with exemplary care, a volume of data, mostly from the state archives, on *Massachusetts Privateers of the Revolution* (*Collections*, vol. LXXVII., pp. vi, 356). Separate commissions or items to the number of 1554 have been collected by his industry, and often his data include interesting bits of narrative. To his collection of data he has prefixed sixty pages of careful history of Massachusetts legislation and other dealings of the state government with privateering in the period concerned.

The October number of the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* contains a first installment of the Journal of Hezekiah Loomis, steward of the U. S. brig *Vixen*, in the war with Tripoli, 1804; the conclusion of Francis B. C. Bradley's account of the Ship *Great Republic* and Donald McKay, her Builder; and several continuations.

*Three Hundred Years of Quincy*, by Daniel M. Wilson and Timothy J. Collins, is published by the Quincy (Mass.) Tercentenary Committee.

The October number of the *Rhode Island Historical Society Collections* contains selections from a body of papers recently presented to the society by Mr. Samuel Ward Greene, including two letters from Washington to General Varnum (November, 1777), one from Martha Washington (1797), one from General Greene to his wife (1780), and one from Col. Otho H. Williams to Mrs. Greene, March, 1781. Among the contents is also a sketch of Gen. James M. Varnum and some account of his house at East Greenwich.

#### MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The July number of the *Quarterly Journal* of the New York State Historical Association contains a discussion, by F. B. Richards, of the

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXIII.—33.

question whether Lord Howe or Colonel Roger Townshend was buried in St. Peter's in Albany; George Washington's Presidential Tour of Long Island Retraced over his Route of 1790, by Meade C. Dobson; a brief article by Professor A. C. Flick on Historical Markers for New York State; and a paper on the Convention of Saratoga, by Janet Beroth.

The title of Valentine's Manual, no. 12, edited and published by H. C. Brown, is *In the Golden Nineties*.

Professor Charles A. Philhower contributes to the October number of the *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society an account of Indian Days in Middlesex County, N. J.; Roger A. Barton an article on the Camden and Amboy Railroad Monopoly; Joseph F. Folsom furnishes a biographical sketch of David Young, Philom., the New Jersey Astronomer; William S. Hunt discourses upon Some Aspects of William Dunlap (1766-1839), artist, dramatist, historian; and Edward S. Rankin gives an account of the Purchase of Newark from the Indians.

*The Development of Agriculture in New Jersey*, by Professor Carl R. Woodward, is published in New Brunswick by the Agricultural Experiment Station of Rutgers University.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has received about 100 volumes of the correspondence of the firm of Lea and Febiger, dating back to the time of Mathew Carey, founder of the firm; 110 letters of Humphrey Marshall, the botanist; the letter-books of Clement Biddle and Company, 1769-1795, of J. G. Biddle, 1814, of Thomas Biddle and John Wharton, 1813-1819, and of Clement Biddle, 1809-1815.

The October number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* contains an article by Harrold E. Gillingham on Some Early Philadelphia Instrument Makers; one by Isaac R. Pennypacker on Civil War Historians and History, wherein most of the historians of the Civil War are weighed in the balances and found wanting—at least in some particulars; and a continuation of the Journal of a Tour from Philadelphia through the Western Counties of Pennsylvania in 1809.

Professor Harry E. Barnes's *The Evolution of Penology in Pennsylvania: a Study in American Social History* (Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Co., pp. 414) is a revised and elaborated history of penal institutions and criminal law in Pennsylvania which was undertaken in 1918 for the Pennsylvania Commission to Investigate Penal Systems.

#### SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

Rev. Dr. Park Leighton has brought out through the firm of Scribner some memories of the South before and during the Civil War, using the title *Turnpikes and Dirt Roads*.

Vol. XLV. of the *Archives of Maryland*, lately published, is the sixth volume of the series of state documents relating to the period of the

Revolutionary War. It contains the *Journal and Correspondence of the State Council of Maryland* (pp. xiii, 706) from July 1, 1780, to November 13, 1781—matter of great importance toward the understanding of the state's action in support of the war, but which it would be impossible to summarize. This being the last volume edited by the late Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, it is appropriately preceded by a well-deserved tribute to his long service in that capacity.

The September number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* contains an account of the Baltimore County Records, by Louis D. Scisco; a muster roll of Captain Thomas Price's company of rifle-men (1775); and two letters from Lieut. Joseph S. Nicholson to Angelo Tilyard, the first written on board the transport ship *Atlas*, near Vera Cruz, June 28, 1847, the second from Vera Cruz harbor, June 29 and 30. The Calvert and Darnall gleanings from English wills, the Maryland rent rolls, and the account and letter-books of Dr. Charles Carroll are continued.

The Virginia State Library has volume III. of *The Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia, 1699-1705* well under way. Volume II. of *The Official Letters of the Governors of the State of Virginia* (the letters of Governor Jefferson) is in press, and a related publication, the *Journal of the House of Delegates* for the session of March, 1781, is in course of preparation. This *Journal* has never hitherto been printed, as the book in which it was recorded was long lost. The library's *Bulletin*, vol. XVI., nos. 2 and 3 (July, 1927), embodies two Confederate items, namely: the Diary of Captain H. W. Wingfield, May 1, 1862, to September 17, 1864, and the Reminiscences of Judge E. C. Moncure of Caroline County, the latter being a reprint of a rare pamphlet.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* has in the October number an article entitled the Equine F. F. Vs., a study of the evidence for the English horses imported into Virginia before the Revolution. In the same number of the *Magazine* is the first part of an article on John White, the First English Artist to visit America, 1585, by David I. Bushnell, jr., reproducing White's famous drawings. Other contents of the number are: Letters of the Byrd Family, contributed chiefly by Mr. William Byrd of New York City; Mrs. Fannie Gaines Tinsley's War Recollections, 1862-1865; and notes of some Revolutionary soldiers, from obituary notices in early Virginia newspapers.

Among the contents of the October number of *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* is an article on John Tyler and the Vice-Presidency, chiefly embodying a letter of Senator B. W. Leigh; the Diary of Miss Harriette Cary of Williamsburg from May 6 to July 24, 1862; and some letters to Jefferson, among them being two (1782, 1784) from John Tyler, speaker of the Virginia house of delegates, and one (1802) from Rev. James Madison, president of the College of William and Mary.



The October number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* contains the paper of Dr. L. C. Gray, the Market Surplus Problems of Colonial Tobacco, read before the Agricultural History Society in December, 1926; an article by Julius F. Prufer on the Franchise in Virginia from Jefferson through the Convention of 1829; a letter from President Ezra Stiles of Yale College to President James Madison, July 12, 1780, and President Madison's reply, August 1; and the fourth installment of the Documents of Sir Francis Wyatt.

*Winchester, Virginia, and its Beginnings*, by K. G. Greene, is brought out by the Shenandoah Publishing House of Strasburg, Va.

The North Carolina Historical Commission has received some 200 manuscript volumes and several thousand papers of Craven County records; 12 volumes of Orange County records; the records of St. George's Parish, Northampton County, 1773-1814; the vestry records of St. John's Parish, Beaufort County, 1743-1841; 698 pages of photostats of North Carolina material from the General Archives of the Indies at Seville; 284 pages of transcripts from the London Public Record Office; and photostats of 27 numbers of the *North Carolina Magazine or Universal Intelligencer* (1764-1765), from the Library of Congress. The Commission is promoting the project of securing a county historian for each county in the state. Efforts beginning late in May resulted in so rapid a response that by the beginning of September the boards of education in thirty counties had made such appointments, the details being suggested, on a comprehensive scale, by the Historical Commission.

Articles in the October number of the *North Carolina Historical Review* are: the Preservation of Florida History, by James A. Robertson; North Carolina Courts and the Confederacy, by J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton; the Grain Trade of Alexandria, Va., 1801-1815, by W. Freeman Galpin; and a reprint of the *Debate on the Fisher Resolutions* (Raleigh, 1824), with an introduction by A. R. Newsome. These resolutions, debated in the House of Commons of North Carolina in December, 1823, were designed by the friends of Calhoun in North Carolina to undermine the political strength of Crawford. They opposed the congressional caucus and advocated the district system of choosing presidential electors. Among the Historical Notes in this issue are: a proclamation of Governor Spaight, Sept. 28, 1793, requiring ports to be quarantined because of the yellow fever in Philadelphia; the action of the town of Newbern in pursuance of the proclamation; a reprint of *An Epistle to Friends* [Quakers] in the colonies, signed by John Bell, Bromley, near London, 1741; and an article found in the *North Carolina Gazette* of Mar. 6, 1778, reprinted from the *London Evening Post*, pronouncing in favor of the American position in the contest.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* has begun, in the number for July, 1927, the publication of the correspondence of Henry Laurens. The series will include in particular the full texts of

letters, extracts of which have been printed by the Carnegie Institution in *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, those cited by Professor Wallace in his *Life of Laurens*, and others which may be of interest or importance. The letters are to be edited by Hon. Joseph W. Barnwell. The July number of the *Magazine* has also an article by A. S. Salley, jr., on the Family of the First Landgrave, Thomas Smith, and continuations of the Records of the Quakers in Charles Town, contributed by Miss Mabel L. Webber.

The series of *Historical Papers* published by the Trinity College Historical Society (Duke University Press) is enriched by a valuable paper on the Supreme Court of North Carolina and Slavery, by Bryce R. Holt.

The Duke University Press is publishing *The Huguenots of Colonial South Carolina*, by Arthur S. Hirsch.

In the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* for September Mr. John Tate Lanning continues his study of American Participation in the War of Jenkins' Ear; Professor John Morris digs deep into Old Norse for the origin of the name of Oglethorpe; and Mr. William M. Brewer discourses upon Some Effects of the Plantation System upon the Ante-Bellum South. In the section of Notes and Documents are some letters of General John Twiggs, in command of the militia during the Creek troubles of 1792 and 1793.

The Florida State Historical Society has in the hands of the printer a volume edited by Professor Wilbur H. Siebert, of the Ohio State University, containing the petitions of the Loyalists of Florida for indemnification on account of losses suffered because of leaving East Florida in 1784. Other volumes which the society has in a state of preparation, more or less advanced, are one containing the *cédulas* of the King of Spain referring to Florida, 1580-1604, translated and edited with an historical introduction by Hon. John B. Stetson, jr., and a volume of papers of the house of Panton, Leslie, and Company, edited by Miss Elizabeth H. West.

The October number of the *Florida Historical Quarterly* contains some letters of Lieut. John W. Phelps, written from Fort Heileman and Saint Augustine in 1837 and 1838; a paper by Eloise R. Ott on Ocala prior to 1868; one on the Ruins of Fort San Luis near Tallahassee, by Venila L. Shores; lists of governors of Spanish East and West Florida, 1781-1821; and some account of land grants in British East Florida.

The contents of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* for April, 1927 (published in October), include a Biography of Henry M. Shreve (1785-1851), by Caroline S. Pfaff; some account of Major John B. Prados, a Confederate Officer, by James A. Renshaw; the Procedure for Sale of an American Vessel in New Orleans, 1803; the second installment of Documents concerning Bienville's Lands in Louisiana, 1719-1737; and an appreciation, by the editor, of the late William Beer.

## WESTERN STATES

Articles in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* are: Roosevelt and Agriculture, by Earle D. Ross; the Early Development of Commerce and Banking in Tennessee, by Thomas P. Abernethy; the Contract and Finance Company and the Central Pacific Railroad, by Harry J. Carman and Charles H. Mueller; and General Joseph Eggleston Johnston, Storm Center of the Confederate Army, by Alfred P. James. In the section devoted to documents is the Diary of a Journey to the Pike's Peak Gold Mines in 1859, reprinted from the *Daily Missouri Republican* of Aug. 9, 1859, and here edited, with an introduction, by Ralph P. Bieber. The author of the diary was Dr. George M. Willing, a resident of St. Louis.

The Augustana Synod of the Lutheran Church was founded in 1860. Since 1870 it has been Swedish, before that partly Norwegian. Scandinavian Lutheran history from the arrival in Illinois of the first Swedish minister, Rev. Lars Esbjörn, in 1849, to the formation of the synod, is carefully recounted by Professor George M. Stephenson, of the University of Minnesota, in *The Founding of the Augustana Synod* (Rock Island, Ill., Augustana Book Concern, pp. 160).

The Western Reserve Historical Society has issued, as *Publication* no. 109, its annual report for the year ending May 1, 1927. Noteworthy among the manuscript accessions of the year are the papers of Hon. A. G. Riddle (1816-1902), member of Congress 1861-1863, and one of the attorneys engaged in the prosecution of John H. Surratt. Many of the papers in the collection pertain to Lincoln's assassination. Another acquisition of the society is a set, lacking one volume, of the eighteen volumes of *The Islander*, a "newspaper" issued in manuscript and a single copy on Kelley's Island, in Sandusky Bay, 1860-1877.

The Indiana Historical Bureau has published *Fort Wayne, the Gateway of the West, 1802-1813* (*Indiana Historical Collections*, vol. XV.), edited by Bert J. Griswold. Besides the orderly books of the garrison, which occupy a large part of the volume, there is an account book, 1802-1811, of John Johnston, Indian agent. Mr. Griswold furnishes an introduction of some eighty pages, relating the history of the early years of Fort Wayne.

The *Indiana Magazine of History* has in the September number, besides the continuation of Allen Wiley's Introduction and Progress of Methodism in Southeastern Indiana, the Civil War Diary of W. C. Benson, January, 1864, to March, 1865, together with some letters of Benson and members of his family.

The *Indiana History Bulletin*, vol. IV., no. 11 (August), has an historical sketch of the Indiana Historical Society and a list of its members, with prefatory remarks by President James A. Woodburn. Vol. IV., extra no. 4, of the *Bulletin* is a monographic study by George Branson, *Archaeological and Historical Survey of Parke County*.

The Indiana Historical Society's *Publications*, vol. VIII., no. 5, is *The Journey of Lewis David von Schweinitz to Goshen, Bartholomew County, in 1831*, translated by Adolf Gerber. Aside from its value for the history of the Moravian Church in the United States, of which von Schweinitz was a minister, the "Journey" (from Bethlehem, Pa., to Goshen, now Hope, Ind.) affords interesting descriptions of modes and conditions of travel and of the status of towns and settlements and pioneer conditions as well. Dr. Christopher B. Coleman furnishes an introduction.

In the April number of the *Journal* of the Illinois State Historical Society Mary L. Miles examines the expression in Lincoln's letter of Mar. 27, 1842, to Joshua F. Speed, "the fatal first of January, 1841", an expression "which has piqued the interest of most students of Lincoln's career". Rev. J. E. Cummings relates the history of the Burning of Sauk-E-Nuk—the Westernmost Battle of the Revolution; Clint C. Tilton writes the romantic story of the Genesis of Old Vermilion, 1826–1926, being the history of an Illinois county; while Mrs. Ella W. Harrison and Mrs. Ella H. Taylor present two sketches of Congregational church history in Illinois, the one of the First Church of Princeton, the other of the First Church of Geneseo. A document of interest is the will of Shadrach Bond, first state governor of Illinois. The July number includes an address, by Cornelius J. Doyle, on Josiah Lamborn, Attorney General of Illinois, 1840–1843; the address of Rev. William E. Barton, entitled the Enduring Lincoln, delivered at Urbana July 3, 1927, at the unveiling of the bronze statue of Lincoln by Lorado Taft; an historical address by John H. Hauberg on the creation of the new Black Hawk State Park; and an article by Edward E. Wingert on Rock River and its Crossings.

Rev. Francis J. Connors contributes to the October number of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* an article on Samuel F. B. Morse and the Anti-Catholic Political Movement in the United States (1791–1872), Rev. Cecil H. Chamberlain, S.J., one on Colonel Francis Vigo and George Rogers Clark, Rev. John Rothensteiner some letters of Bishop Fenwick of Boston to Bishop Rosati of St. Louis (1830–1840), and Joseph J. Thompson the fourth chapter in his study, *Illinois: the Cradle of Christianity and Civilization in Mid-America*.

A *History of the Central Conference Mennonite Church*, by Rev. William B. Weaver, is to be obtained by application to the author at Bloomington, Ill.

The October number of the *History Quarterly* contains a Review of the Efforts to Develop Water Power at the Falls of the Ohio, a paper read before the Filson Club in December, 1921, by Charles K. Needham; an article on the Origin of the Names Beargrass Creek, the Point, and Thruston Square, by Otto H. Rothert; one on the Battle of Upper Blue Licks, by R. S. Cotterill; and a survey of local historical activities in Kentucky, by Dr. Willard R. Jillson.

The *Register* of the Kentucky State Historical Society has in the September number part I. of an article by Dr. Willard R. Jillson embodying Early Floyd County Marriage Records, 1803-1860; an article by Major Edgar E. Hume on the Confederate Medal of Honor and the Kentuckians who have Won it; and the concluding installment of the Life and Times of Robert B. McAfee and his Family Connections, written by himself.

*Nolichucky Jack*, by John T. Faris, is the story of John Sevier, of Tennessee (Lippincott, pp. 288).

The series of the *Messages of the Governors of Michigan*, published by the Michigan Historical Commission and edited by its secretary, Dr. George N. Fuller, is now completed by the issue of vol. IV. (pp. 1021) presenting the governors' messages from 1897 to 1927.

Articles in the October number of the *Michigan History Magazine* are: Bridges across the Atlantic, by Mrs. Cornelia S. Hulst; Calvin College, Grand Rapids, 1894-1927, by Dean Albert J. Rooks; Dr. Tappan, First President of the University of Michigan, by Charles M. Perry; Jesuit Influence in the Development of Michigan, by Catherine F. Babbitt; Old Furniture in the Ford Collections at Dearborn, by Henry A. Haigh; and Biography and Romance in Detroit Street Names, by George B. Catlin.

The Burton Historical Collection has acquired photostat copies of the letter-book of James Sterling, 1761-1765, of the parish records (1794-1840) and registers (1830-1839) of St. Antoine Parish (Roman Catholic), Monroe, Mich., and of the register of the Church of England at Sandwich, Upper Canada, 1802-1812; also a small group of papers of Caleb Atwater of Wallingford, Conn., chiefly pertaining to land purchases and titles in Ohio, 1795-1855, but including also a diary of Atwater of a journey to "New Connecticut" and return in 1799, and a diary of Joshua Atwater of a journey from Connecticut to Ohio and return in 1805. Mr. C. M. Burton has prepared a digest of the first thousand probate records of Wayne County, Mich., which has been indexed. The *Leaflet* of September is a biography of Daniel de Joncaire de Chabert, by M. M. Quaife. That for November is *Detroit Battles: the Blue Licks*, by M. M. Quaife.

The intensive studies for the *Wisconsin Domesday Book* have brought to publication a volume on *Four Wisconsin Counties, Prairie and Forest*, prepared by Dr. Joseph Schafer, superintendent of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and published by the society (pp. 429). The four counties, Kenosha and Racine, prairie counties originally, and Milwaukee and Ozaukee, forest counties, all in southeastern Wisconsin, are described in their period of settlement after the Black Hawk War, and the history of population, agriculture, social changes, and educational progress is presented with full data and intelligent discussion. Ap-

pendixes provide much statistical information, and a soil map and map of land entries for each township of the four counties.

The private business papers, correspondence, journals, etc., accumulated by the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, have been deposited for permanent preservation with the State Historical Society of Wisconsin; their ownership and control, however, remain for some years yet in the hands of the family.

In the September number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* William J. Leonard describes vividly the Chicago Fire; Edgar P. Houghton contributes a History of Company I, Fourteenth Wisconsin Infantry, 1861-1865; Albert O. Barton relates Some Experiences of a Soldier-Railroader (Ransom C. Luther); and W. A. Titus, in the series Historic Spots in Wisconsin, gives an account of Green Bay, the Plymouth Rock of Wisconsin. The Letters of the Reverend Adelbert Inama (1842-1843) are mission reports of a Premonstratensian from Tyrol. They are taken from the *Central-Blatt* of St. Louis and are translated by Karl Hohlfeld.

Besides the Minnesota Historical Society's acquisition of a collection of photographic copies of manuscript maps in the French archives (see pp. 328-330), the society has received a transcript from the archives of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions of a detailed report made in 1849 by Samuel Pond, a missionary to the Sioux in Minnesota; and a transcript of a diary kept by Mitchell Y. Jackson describing a trip from Indiana to Minnesota in 1854.

The December number of *Minnesota History* contains an article by Henry Commager on the Literature of the Pioneer West; one by Thomas P. Christensen on Danish Settlement in Minnesota; the unfinished autobiography of Henry H. Sibley, edited by Theodore C. Blegen; and a translation by Roy Swanson of a Swedish traveller's description of Minnesota in the early 'seventies, drawn from Hugo Nisbeth's *Two Years in America: 1872-1874* (Stockholm, 1874).

The Arthur H. Clark Company, of Cleveland, announces the publication of *Recollections, 1829-1923, of Christopher C. Andrews*, Minnesota's last Civil War general, sixty-five years a resident of that state, prominent in the advocacy of forest conservation, in the Kansas troubles of 1854-1857, in the work of Reconstruction, and in the public affairs of Minnesota. He was also minister to Sweden and Norway, 1869-1877. The volume is edited by his daughter.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has acquired a diary (in 65 volumes) kept by Adeline K. Jones of Iowa City for the period 1859-1922, which contains a wealth of information concerning Iowa City during those years. The society has distributed a biography, by J. A. Swisher, of Leonard F. Parker, for many years professor in the State University of Iowa and in Grinnell College. One of the society's recent



activities has been furnishing the Associated Press 1000 questions and answers concerning Iowa, and it is now contributing through the same news agency a series of "Stories out of Iowa's Past".

The *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* completed, with the October number, a quarter of a century of vigorous life. It was established in 1903 upon the recommendation of Dr. Benjamin F. Shambaugh and has remained under his editorial charge from the beginning. The pages of this number are largely devoted to an account of the Legislation of the Forty-second General Assembly of Iowa, by Jacob A. Swisher and Dorothy Schaffter.

The September number of the *Palimpsest* contains a sketch, by F. R. Aumann, of Poweshiek, chief of the Foxes at the period of the Black Hawk War, and the speeches delivered at the council held by the Secretary of War at Washington October 5, 1837. The latter are reprinted from *Niles' Register*. In the October number is the Biography of a Newspaper, the career of the Davenport *Daily Evening News*, adapted from Franc B. Wilkie's *Personal Reminiscences of Thirty-five Years of Journalism*. The November number has a sketch, by Mr. Aumann, of Mahaska, the Ioway chief who signed a treaty in Washington in 1824.

The October number of the *Annals of Iowa* includes an appreciation, by Montaville Flowers, of William I. Atkinson (1876-1925), sometime speaker of the Iowa house of representatives; a classification of the records in the office of the adjutant-general, by C. C. Stiles, superintendent of public archives; and some account by the editor of Old Buckingham in Tama County.

The Missouri Historical Society *Collections*, vol. V., no. 1 (October, 1927), contains a memorial address on Governor David R. Francis, by Hon. Harry B. Hawes; an article by Edward V. Papin entitled the Village under the Hill; a Sketch of Early St. Louis, compiled principally from the notes of the late Pierre Chouteau; a paper by Edgar B. Wesley on James Callaway in the War of 1812: Letters, Diary, and Rosters; and some records of the Callaway Family, by Sarah M. Carpenter.

The October number of the *Missouri Historical Review* contains a sketch, by Rollin J. Brinton, of Joseph H. Burrows (1840-1918), member of the Missouri house of representatives 1871-1875, 1879-1881, and of the Forty-seventh Congress; an article by Samuel L. Jordan on Farming as it used to be and as it is in Missouri; one by W. L. Webb entitled Independence, Missouri, a Century Old; and one by W. J. Hamilton on the Relief Movement in Missouri, 1820-1822.

The *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* has in the October number an article by R. L. Biesele entitled the German Settlers and the Indians in Texas, 1844-1860; a History of the J. A. Ranch, by Harley T. Burton; the third of James K. Greer's papers concerning the Committee on the Texan Declaration of Independence; and other continuations.

The contents of the September number of the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* include an article by Professor M. L. Wardell of the University of Oklahoma entitled Southwest's History written in Oklahoma's Boundary Story; a Version of a Famous Battle (Arickaree), by F. M. Lockard; the Report of Captain John Stuart on the Construction of the Road from Fort Smith to Horse Prairie on Red River (1832), contributed by Carolyn T. Foreman, and the concluding installment of Judge Thomas H. Doyle's papers on Single versus Double Statehood.

*Sixty Years in Southwest Oklahoma: or the Autobiography of George W. Conover, with thrilling Incidents of Indian Life in Oklahoma and Texas*, is offered at Anadarko, Okla., by the author.

The August number of the *Colorado Magazine* has an article by Luke Cahill entitled an Indian Campaign and Buffalo Hunting with "Buffalo Bill", being an extract from a longer manuscript entitled Recollections of a Plainsman; one by LeRoy R. Hafen on Supplies and Market Prices in Pioneer Denver; and one by Lillian B. Shields on Relations with the Cheyennes and Arapahoes in Colorado to 1861. There is also an account, by Edward W. Milligan, of Some Early Books on the West.

The October number of the *New Mexico Historical Review* contains an article by Charles A. Gianini on Manuel Lisa, one by Lansing B. Bloom on the death (1806) of Jacques D'Eglise, a French trader, and the conclusion of the serial publication, the Rodríguez Expedition to New Mexico, 1581-1582, by George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey.

Sheriff Pat Garrett's *Authentic Life of Billy the Kid, the Noted Desperado of the Southwest*, was published at Santa Fe in 1882. That somewhat rare book has now been edited by M. G. Fulton (Macmillan, pp. xxviii, 233, with illustrations), and, supplemented by the editor's additional information, constitutes not merely a picturesque narrative but a striking contribution to knowledge of vanished conditions in a portion of American society.

Articles in the October number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* are: Steptoe Butte and Steptoe Battle-Field, by T. C. Elliott; My Arrival in Washington in 1852, by Margaret W. Iman; Early Days at the Cascades, by George Iman; and the concluding installments of R. L. Reid's account of the Whatcom Trails to the Fraser River Mines in 1858 and of Mrs. Lucy A. Ide's Diary of a Journey to Washington in 1878. In the section of Documents are some materials pertaining to Capt. William H. Fauntleroy, commander of the United States propeller *Masachusetts* during the San Juan Island negotiations in 1859.

The September number of the *Oregon Historical Quarterly* contains an appreciation of the late Frederick V. Holman, by N. J. Levinson; an address by Hon. George M. Brown, entitled Gleanings from the Story of our Oregon Pioneers; the Journal and Report by Dr. Marcus Whitman of his Tour of Exploration with Rev. Samuel Parker in 1835 be-

yond the Rocky Mountains, with introduction and annotations by Professor F. G. Young; and the Journal of the Ship *Ruby*, a trading vessel on the Oregon coast in 1795-1796; Mr. T. C. Elliott furnishes an introduction and notes to the Journal.

Mrs. Gertrude F. H. Atherton has brought out a revised and enlarged edition of *California: an Intimate History* (New York, Liveright).

The University of California Press announces *Crespi, Missionary Explorer, 1769-1774*, edited by Professor H. E. Bolton, and containing diaries and letters of Father Crespi.

At the instance of the synod of California, the Rev. Dr. Edward A. Wicher, professor in the San Francisco Theological Seminary, has prepared a competent and intelligent *History of the Presbyterian Church in California, 1849-1927* (New York, Frederick H. Hitchcock, pp. xi, 360), giving much local information about churches and ministers.

Father Reginald Yzendoorn, of the Congregation of Picpus, makes an important contribution to the religious history and other history of Hawaii by a *History of the Catholic Mission in the Hawaiian Islands* (Honolulu, *Star-Bulletin*, pp. xiv, 254), from the arrival from Paris of the missionaries of the Congregation of the Sacred Heart in 1827.

#### CANADA

The *Report* of the Canadian Public Archives for the year 1926 gives a long list of transcripts from English, French, and Canadian archives, received during the year, and a list of maps received in the period 1924-1926.

The *Canadian Historical Review* for September has a paper by Professor R. G. Trotter on Canadian History in Universities of the United States, showing a recent development of that subject which will surprise many readers. Mr. William Smith, of the Canadian Archives, presents a very able review of Lord Durham's administration. Mr. A. H. U. Colquhoun, deputy minister of education for Ontario, contributes interesting memoranda, from sources not stated, of conferences which John Rose of Canada and Edward Thornton, British minister, had with Secretary Fish in 1869 on the subject of reciprocity with the United States.

An article on *The Growth of Canadian National Feeling*, contributed in 1920 to the *Canadian Historical Review* by Mr. W. Stewart Wallace, librarian of the University of Toronto, has been expanded by the author and brought out as a small book of 85 pages by the Macmillan Company of Canada (Toronto).

The *Collections* of the New Brunswick Historical Society contains the following papers: Epitomized History of Saint John, N. B., by John Willet, K. C.; Some Notes on the History of Charlotte County, N. B., by

Rev. J. W. Milledge; Life and Times of Dr. John Caleff, a prominent Loyalist, by Henry Wilmot; and George W. Orser and the Orserites (a local religious sect), by M. L. Hayward.

Quaker histories seem to be always carefully and accurately made. Professor Arthur G. Dorland's *History of the Society of Friends (Quakers) in Canada* (Toronto, Macmillan Company, pp. xiii, 345), besides carefulness in narrating the history of Quaker migrations into Canada of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, of settlements of Friends in the various districts of Canada, and of movements of organization and subsequent development, is marked by candor, insight, and moderation, especially in treating such crises as the separation between Orthodox and Hicksites in 1828 and that between conservatives and progressives in 1881.

#### AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

Three articles especially mark the November number of the *Hispanic American Historical Review*: one by Francis M. Stanger of the University of California on Church and State in Peru; one by Arthur Hasbrouck of Columbia University on Gregor MacGregor and the Colonization of Poyais, 1820-1824, and one on the Hispanic American Policy of Henry Clay by Professor Halford L. Hoskins of Tufts College.

Professor N. A. N. Cleven's volume of *Readings in Hispanic American History* (Boston, Ginn, pp. xx, 791) is in itself a convincing sign of that increase of interest in Latin American history which has been so marked a trait of recent years in this country. It contains some two hundred pieces, narrative or documentary, illustrating in a multitude of ways the life of pre-Columbian America, the period of the establishment of the Spanish and Portuguese in the New World, their institutions and economics, the wars of emancipation, the constitutional and political development of Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile, and the varied international relations between the United States and Great Britain and the Hispanic American republics. The selection gives an excellent combination of what is important and what is interesting.

Don Rafael Altamira, of the University of Madrid and of the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague, is presently entering upon the publication of an exceedingly important historical series which, executed as he will cause it to be executed, will be of the highest value to students of Spanish-America. Under the general title, *Colección de Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de Hispano-América*, six quarto illustrated volumes will be published each year. The object of the series is to present to workers in the field a great mass of material, illustrative of the history of the Spanish empire in general rather than that of particular American countries, so selected as to provide the historian with what is really significant toward useful studies of institutional, economic, and social development in Spanish-America. Thus, a critical edition of

the laws of the Indies will be presented, other documents of general legislation, materials on transmarine migration, on colonial finance, fleets and commerce, the organization and workings of the Casa de Contratación, colonization and municipalities, the regulation of natives, instructions to viceroys and their *memorias*, and the like. Subscriptions, at 125 pesetas for the six annual volumes, may be sent to the Compañía Ibero-Americano de Publicaciones, Don Ramon de la Cruz 51, Madrid.

The Ibero-American Library at the Catholic University of America, depository of the notable collection of Spanish and Portuguese books given to the university by Professor Manoel de Oliveira Lima, has published *A Bibliographical and Historical Description of the Rarest Books in the Oliveira Lima Collection* (pp. 367), by Miss Ruth E. V. Holmes, assistant librarian. More than 200 books are described, mostly with extensive and important notes, valuable to bibliographer and historian. Naturally books relating to Brazil predominate.

No. 23 of the *Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano* (pp. xl, 345) concerns "La Primera Guerra entre Mexico y Francia", and contains a valuable exposition of the diplomatic history involved, by Señor Antonio de la Peña y Reyes, the correspondence of 1837-1838 between the Mexican ministry of foreign relations and the French legation, documents relating to the conferences of Jalapa and the British mediation, and similar pieces, ending with the treaty of 1839.

The Mexican Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores has undertaken the preparation and publication of a series of elaborate bibliographies of the individual states. That for Sinaloa has already been mentioned in these pages. The latest issue received is a *Bibliografía de Coahuila*, by Señor Vito A. Robles (pp. xxxix, 450), in which books, pamphlets, journals, maps, and manuscripts relating to the history of that state (and therefore in some degree to that of Texas) are catalogued with, in many cases, elaborate annotation. The manual will certainly be indispensable to students of the history of Coahuila.

Hon. Henry L. Stimson, formerly Secretary of War, whom President Coolidge sent last spring to Nicaragua as his special representative to investigate the situation there, has published a small book, *American Policy in Nicaragua* (Scribner, pp. 129), in which he gives an account of the relations of the United States with the successive Nicaraguan governments and of his own activities in effecting a settlement.

In a small book, privately printed, with the title *The Black Rebellion in Haiti*, Mr. Charles Platt has reprinted a narrative written in 1804 by his grandfather, Pierre Étienne Chazotte, a former planter of St. Domingo and one of the few survivors of the Haitian massacres. This vivid eyewitness account, first written in French, was later translated into English and printed (New York, 1840). Mr. Platt has effected some abridgment.

Dr. Vicente Dávila, of the Venezuelan national archives, completes with the second volume his *Diccionario Biográfico de Ilustres Próceres de la Independencia Suramericana* (Caracas, Tip. Americana). In the two volumes, biographical sketches of more than a thousand heroes of South American independence are given, compiled with care from materials in the Venezuelan archives.

Jean de Léry's *Histoire d'un Voyage en la Terre du Brésil*, first published in 1578, and now difficult to procure even in Gaffarel's reprint, is again reprinted by M. Charly Clerc of Geneva in a handy volume, reproducing some of the woodcuts of the original, *Le Voyage au Brésil de Jean de Léry, 1556-1558* (Paris, Payot, pp. 319).

Tomo V. of the *Biblioteca Argentina de Libros Raros Americanos* (Buenos Aires, Inst. de Investigaciones Historicas, pp. xxiv, 285, 21), is a facsimile reproduction of the *Ordenanzas, Actas Primeras de la Moderna Provincia de San Augustin de Buenos Ayres, Thucuman, y Paraguay del Orden de Predicadores* (1742?), by Father Domingo de Neyra, of which only four copies are known. This vigorous creole was a member of this Dominican province from its foundation in 1724 and its provincial from 1737. His book, perhaps the first published by a man of Buenos Aires, has much autobiographical and historical value.

Mr. William J. Dennis's *Documentary History of the Tacna-Arica Dispute* (University of Iowa Studies, pp. 262) contains some eighty pertinent documents, mostly of the period 1879-1882, with introductions, not well written, but adequate for understanding of the controversy. The documents concerning its latest phases are President Coolidge's opinion and award (March, 1925) and General Lassiter's report on the attempted plebiscite (July, 1926).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Vernon C. Allison, *The Mound Builders: Whence and When* (American Anthropologist, October-December); J. A. Broderick, *Toleration of the Early Settlers of New Hampshire* (Granite Monthly, November); Charles Warren, *Sources of Knowledge of the Constitution* (Constitutional Review, July); C. O. Paullin, *Origin of the Continental Navy* (United States Naval Institute Proceedings, November); Capt. Fred E. Hagner, *The Story of the Quartermaster Corps, 1775-1927* (Quartermaster Review, September-October); *Brevet General Officers in the Regular Army, 1775-1927* (Coast Artillery Journal, November); J. T. Adams, *The Burgoyne Expedition* (North American Review, October); Comm. A. H. Miles, *Sea Power and the Yorktown Campaign* (United States Naval Institute Proceedings, November); J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, *Jefferson and Adams at Ease* (South Atlantic Quarterly, October); Marguerite M. McKee, *Service of Supply in the War of 1812, V.* (Quartermaster Review, September-October); G. d'Anglade, *Une Page de l'Histoire de la Louisiane; les Lafitte* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); E. M. Earle, *Early American Policy concerning Ottoman Minorities* (Political Science



Quarterly, September); Henry H. Metcalf, *Franklin Pierce and Edmund Burke* (Granite Monthly, October); W. L. Fleming, *The Religious Life of Jefferson Davis* (Confederate Veteran, October, November); Robert W. Barnwell, *Fort Sumter, 1860-1861* (*ibid.*, November); Mrs. A. R. Dodson, *Tennessee in the Confederate Congresses* (*ibid.*); Margarita S. Gerry, *The Real Andrew Johnson* (Century Magazine, November, December); Marguerite H. Albjerg, *The New York Press and Andrew Johnson* (South Atlantic Quarterly, October); J. G. deR. Hamilton, *Those Southern Repudiated Bonds* (Virginia Quarterly Review, October); L. H. Woolsey, *The Personal Diplomacy of Colonel House* (American Journal of International Law, October); Silas Bent, *Adding one Newspaper to another: the Life Story of the Scripps-Howard Chain* (Century Magazine, November); Sir Patrick T. McGrath, *The Labrador Boundary Decision* (Geographical Review, October); *The Diary of Padre Juan Antonio Rivera* [1676-1696] (Bulletin of the Pan American Union, December); Adolf Hasenclever, *Zur Geschichte der Filibustier* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXVI. 3); J. Tramond, *Saint-Domingue en 1756 et 1757 d'après la Correspondance de l'Ordonnateur Lambert*, II. (Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, XV. 3); Louis Sonolet, *L'Agonie de l'Empire du Mexique*, I., concl. (Revue de Paris, August 1, 15); Lowell Thomas, *A Vampire of the Spanish Main* [the story of Count Felix von Luckner and his ocean raider, the *Seeadler*] (World's Work, October).

Unavoidable delays in the bringing out of this January number of the *Review* make it possible to insert the following announcements:

In addition to the gift made by Mrs. Beveridge, and reported on page 463, *supra*, it was announced at the business meeting that Mrs. Alice Griswold, of Radnor, Pennsylvania, offered to the Association the sum of \$25,000, for purposes of research in American history. The Fund, accepted with much gratitude by the Association, is to be called the "Littleton-Griswold Fund", in memory of Mrs. Griswold's father and her husband, the late Frank T. Griswold.

It was voted that the next meeting of the Association should be held in Indianapolis on December 28, 29, and 31 (December 30 being Sunday).

Mr. Fairfax Harrison having declined nomination to the Executive Council, Mr. William L. Clements was elected a member of that body.

The following were elected to serve as the Nominating Committee for the next year: Charles W. Hackett, University of Texas, chairman, Randolph G. Adams, Percy A. Martin, Laurence B. Packard, and Lucy E. Textor.

The Council reported (along with other committee appointments which will be listed in our April number) the appointment of Arthur C. Cole as a member of the Board of Editors, to succeed Professor Dodd, whose

term had expired, and of Verner W. Crane to succeed Professor Greene, who had resigned from the Board on being elected second vice-president of the Association.

On recommendation of the special Committee on Future Arrangements for the *Review*, the Council appointed Professor Dana C. Munro managing editor for a period of one year beginning July 1, 1928.

#### CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

Dr. Henry Osborn Taylor, the President of the American Historical Association, is the author of *Ancient Ideals*, *The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages*, *The Mediaeval Mind*, *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century*, and *Freedom of the Mind*.

Dr. Edwin E. Aubrey is Weyerhaeuser professor of Biblical literature and chairman of the department of religion in Vassar College.

Dr. Raymond J. Sontag is an assistant professor of history in Princeton University.

Dr. Avery O. Craven is an associate professor of history in the University of Illinois.

Dr. Henry E. Bourne is a professor of history in the College for Women, Western Reserve University.

Mr. Carl L. Lokke is an instructor in history in Columbia University.

Dr. Louis C. Karpinski is a professor of mathematics in the University of Michigan.

In the page respecting contributors to the October number (p. 226) an error was made in stating that Dr. Robert E. Riegel is a professor of economics. Dr. Riegel is a professor of history in Dartmouth College.